THE DOLPHIN.

VOL. V. FEBRUARY, 1904. NO. 2.

POPULAR CATHOLIC ACTION.

Pius X, Pope.

"MOTU PROPRIO."

IN our first encyclical to the Bishops of the world, in which we echo all that our glorious predecessors had laid down concerning the Catholic action of the laity, we declared that this action was deserving of the highest praise, and was indeed necessary in the present condition of the Church and of society. And we cannot but praise warmly the zeal shown by so many illustrious personages who have for a long time dedicated themselves to this glorious task, and the ardor of so many brilliant young people who have eagerly hastened to lend their aid to the same. The nineteenth Catholic Congress lately held at Bologna, and by us promoted and encouraged, has sufficiently proved to all the vigor of the Catholic forces as well as what useful and salutary results may be obtained among a population of believers, when this action is well governed and disciplined, and when unity of thought, sentiment, and action prevail among those who take part in it.

But we are very sorry to find that certain differences which arose in the midst of them have produced discussions unfortunately too vivacious, which, if not dispelled in time, might serve to divide those forces of which we have spoken, and render them less efficacious. Before the Congress we recommended above all things unity and harmony, in order that it might be possible to lay down by common accord the general lines for the practical working of the Catholic movement; we cannot therefore be silent now. And since divergences of view in matters of practice have commonly their origin in the domain of theory, and indeed necessarily find their fulcrum in the latter, it is necessary to define

clearly the principles on which the entire Catholic movement must be based.

Our illustrious predecessor, Leo XIII, of holy memory, traced out luminously the rules that must be followed in the Christian movement among the people in the great encyclicals *Quod Apostolici muneris*, of December 28, 1878; *Rerum novarum*, of May 15, 1891; and *Graves de communi*, of January 18, 1901; and further in a particular Instruction emanating from the Sacred Congregation for Extraordinary Ecclesiastical Affairs, of January 27, 1902.

And we, realizing, as did our predecessor, the great need that the Christian movement among the people be rightly governed and conducted, desire to have those most prudent rules exactly and completely fulfilled, and to provide that nobody may dare depart from them in the smallest particulars. Hence, to keep them more vividly present before people's minds, we have deemed it well to summarize them in the following articles, which will constitute the fundamental plan of Catholic popular movement.

Fundamental Regulations.

I. Human society, as established by God, is composed of unequal elements, just as the different parts of the human body are unequal;—to make them all equal is impossible, and would mean the destruction of human society. (Encyclical, *Quod Apostolici Muneris.*)

II. The equality existing among the various social members consists only in this: that all men have their origin in God the Creator, have been redeemed by Jesus Christ, and are to be judged and rewarded or punished by God exactly according to their merits or demerits. (Encyclical, *Quod Apostolici Muneris.*)

III. Hence it follows that there are, according to the ordinance of God, in human society princes and subjects, masters and proleteriat, rich and poor, learned and ignorant, nobles and plebeians, all of whom, united in the bonds of love, are to help one another to attain their last end in Heaven, and their material and moral welfare here on earth. (Encyclical, *Quod Apostolici Muneris.*)

IV. Of the goods of the earth man has not merely the use,

like the brute creation, but he has also the right of permanent proprietorship—and not merely of those things which are consumed by use, but also of those which are not consumed by use. (Encyclical, *Rerum Novarum.*)

V. The right of private property, the fruit of labor or industry, or of concession or donation by others, is an incontrovertible natural right; and everybody can dispose reasonably of such property as he thinks fit. (Encyclical, *Rerum Novarum.*)

VI. To heal the breach between rich and poor, it is necessary to distinguish between justice and charity. There can be no claim for redress except when justice is violated. (Encyclical, *Rerum Novarum.*)

Obligations of Justice.

VII. The following are obligations of justice binding on the proletariat and the workingman: To perform fully and faithfully the work which has been freely and, according to equity, agreed upon; not to injure the property or outrage the person of masters; even in the defence of their own rights to abstain from acts of violence, and never to make mutiny of their defence. (Encyclical, *Rerum Novarum.*)

VIII. The following are obligations of justice binding on capitalists: To pay just wages to their workingmen; not to injure their just savings by violence or fraud, or by overt or covert usuries; not to expose them to corrupting seductions and danger of scandal; not to alienate them from the spirit of family life and from love of economy; not to impose on them labor beyond their strength, or unsuitable for their age or sex. (Encyclical, *Rerum Novarum.*)

IX. It is an obligation for the rich and those who own property to succor the poor and the indigent, according to the precepts of the Gospel. This obligation is so grave that on the Day of Judgment special account will be demanded of its fulfilment, as Christ Himself has said (Matthew 25). (Encyclical, *Rerum Novarum.*)

X. The poor should not be ashamed of their poverty, nor disdain the charity of the rich, for they should have especially in view Jesus the Redeemer, who, though He might have been born in riches, made Himself poor in order that He might ennoble

poverty and enrich it with merits beyond price for heaven. (Encyclical, *Rerum Novarum.*)

XI. For the settlement of the social question much can be done by the capitalists and workers themselves, by means of institutions designed to provide timely aid for the needy and to bring together and unite mutually the two classes. Among these institutions are mutual aid societies, various kinds of private insurance societies, orphanages for the young, and, above all, associations among the different trades and professions. (Encyclical, *Rerum Novarum.*)

Christian Democracy.

XII. This end is especially aimed at by the movement of Christian Popular Action of Christian Democracy in its many and varied branches. But Christian Democracy must be taken in the sense already authoritatively defined. Totally different from the movement known as *Social Democracy*, it has for its basis the principles of Catholic faith and morals—especially the principle of not injuring in any way the inviolable right of private property. (Encyclical, *Graves de Communi.*)

XIII. Moreover, Christian Democracy must have nothing to do with politics, and never be able to serve political ends or parties; this is not its field; but it must be a beneficent movement for the people, and founded on the law of nature and the precepts of the Gospel. (Encyclical, *Graves de Communi*, Instructions of the S. Cong. for E. E. Affairs.)

Christian Democrats in Italy must abstain from participating in any political action—this is under present circumstances forbidden to every Catholic *for reasons of the highest order.* (Instructions as cited.)

XIV. In performing its functions, Christian Democracy is bound most strictly to depend upon ecclesiastical authority, and to offer full submission and obedience to the Bishops and those who represent them. There is no meritorious zeal or sincere piety in enterprises, however beautiful and good in themselves, when they are not approved by the pastor. (Encyclical, *Graves de Communi.*)

XV. In order that the Christian Democratic movement in

Italy may be united in its efforts, it must be under the direction of the Association of Catholic Congresses and Committees, which, during many years of fruitful labor, has deserved so well of Holy Church, and to which Pius IX, and Leo XIII, of holy memory, entrusted the charge of directing the whole Catholic movement, always, of course, under the auspices and guidance of the Bishops. (Encyclical, *Graves de Communi.*)

Catholic Writers.

XVI. Catholic writers must, in all that touches religious interests and the action of the Church in society, subject themselves entirely in intellect and will, like the rest of the faithful, to their Bishops and to the Roman Pontiff. They must above all, take care not to anticipate the judgments of the Holy See in this important matter. (Instruction as cited.)

XVII. Christian Democratic writers must, like all other Catholic writers, submit to the previous examination of the Ordinary all writings which concern religion, Christian morals, and natural ethics, by virtue of the Constitution *Officiorum et munerum* (Art. 41). By the same Constitution ecclesiastics must obtain the previous consent of the Ordinary for publication of writings of a merely technical character. (Instruction.)

XVIII. They must, moreover, make every effort and every sacrifice to ensure that charity and harmony may reign among them. When causes of disagreement arise, they should, instead of printing anything on the matter in the papers, refer it to the ecclesiastical authority, which will then act with justice. And when taken to task by the ecclesiastical authority, let them obey promptly without evasion or public complaints—the right to appeal to a higher authority being understood when the case requires it; and it should be made in the right way. (Instruction.)

XIX. Finally, let Catholic writers take care, when defending the cause of the proletariat and the poor, not to use language calculated to inspire aversion among the people of the upper classes of society. Let them refrain from speaking of redress and justice when the matter comes within the domain of charity only, as has been explained above. Let them remember that Jesus Christ endeavored to unite all men in the bond of mutual love, which

is the perfection of justice, and which carries with it the obligation of working for the welfare of one another. (Instruction.)

The foregoing fundamental rules we of our own initiative and with certain knowledge do renew by our apostolic authority in all their parts, and we ordain that they be transmitted to all Catholic Committees, Societies, and Unions of every kind. All these societies are to keep them exposed in their rooms and to have them read frequently at their meetings. We ordain, moreover, that Catholic papers publish them in their entirety and make declaration of their observance of them—and, in fact, observe them religiously; failing to do this they are to be gravely admonished, and if they do not then amend, let them be interdicted by ecclesiastical authority.

But as words and energetic action are of no avail unless preceded, accompanied, and followed constantly by example, the necessary characteristic which should shine forth in all the members of every Catholic association is that of openly manifesting their faith by the holiness of their lives, by the spotlessness of their morals, and by the scrupulous observance of the laws of God and of the Church. And this because it is the duty of every Christian, and also in order that he *who stands against us may blush, having nothing evil to say of us.* (Tit. 2 : 8.)

From this solicitude of ours for the common good of Catholic action, especially in Italy, we hope, through the blessing of God, to reap abundant and happy fruits.

Given at Rome, at St. Peter's, on December 18, 1903, in the first year of our Pontificate.

PIUS X, POPE.

SOCIALISM.

Fourth Article.

IN the last article, a brief review was made of the strength and weakness of Socialism. As suggested, Socialism has very important aspects which are logical, psychological, historical, economic, and ethical. An error or a false assumption in any one

of these orders is theoretically a source of weakness in the system of Socialism. Practically, however, it will be a weakness only when it hinders in fact the propaganda; that is, when men are deterred by it from becoming Socialists. Hence, the safer standpoint from which to compute Socialism's power is a practical one. We should find out the traits in Socialism which actually favor or actually hinder its growth. An effort was made in the last article to direct the reader's attention that way. There are one or two supplementary thoughts which might be added here before going on to a review of the methods employed to hinder Socialism's advance.

There is strength in numbers. Socialism possesses it in Europe, and it is slowly acquiring it here. Not all Socialists vote; nor are all votes cast for a socialist candidate, socialistic votes. Many local circumstances may swell the vote for a candidate at one time and diminish it at another time. Hence, the joy of the press over the recent fall in the socialistic vote in Massachusetts was as unfounded as was its concern some time ago, when the vote was highest. Many are called Socialists who are not so in fact. Flint may not be guilty of great exaggeration when he says:[1] "The pretenders to the name of Socialists outnumber those who are entitled to it, and of those who are entitled to it, comparatively few are students of social or any other science."

Socialism possesses not only the power to win adherents but also the power to hold them. In view of the radical revolution of mind which it connotes, this is a remarkable trait of the movement. The feeling that one belongs to a cause that has a great future, the emotional intoxication that sometimes takes possession of reformers, the habit of self-exculpation by which men convince themselves of personal innocence, and blame social institutions for all wrong, and the overpowering conviction of being right, are all sources of much power to Socialism. A Socialist said some time since in a letter, that no sincere man could read two of his pamphlets without becoming a Socialist. He added: "I stand upon the immovable rock of eternal and universal justice and I challenge the wisdom and sophistry of the entire world to destroy my foundation." Mr. Clarence Darrow, who is well

[1] *Agnosticism*, p. 77.

known in the United States, writing from Germany recently, says of the German Socialists: "They are really not politicians; they are religious fanatics, devoted to the rights of man, and while they have no hope of future reward, they give their time, their strength, their money, and their reputation to the cause. Their workers from the highest to the lowest forget their small ambitions and cheerfully (*sic*) risk their liberties and even their lives for the sake of generations yet unborn. With such a band of devoted men and women and such a cause to give them strength and inspiration, it is easy to understand the great victories that they have won in the past and the sublime confidence with which they look to the future for complete and final triumph." (*Miners' Magazine*, December 10, 1903.)

We who are calm and conservative miss many of the most appealing traits of Socialism, and we forget the comprehensiveness of its promises. The dissatisfied Christian, the pessimistic artist, the idealizing litterateur, the discontented artisan, the resentful bankrupt, the unselfish philanthropist—every one of them finds in Socialism a message personal to himself—a personal promise of the realization of personal ideals, whatever they may be. But antecedent to all Socialism there must be some form of despair concerning our institutions as they now stand. One cannot understand the movement and its power without placing oneself at that point of departure in all of one's study.

The Checking of Socialism.

The great forces in modern society—Church, State, Political Party, Property Owners, Employers, Labor Unions — oppose Socialism with determination. The Catholic Church, it may be said, makes opposition in the name of religion, social order and justice. The Encyclical of Pope Leo XIII may be taken as the outline of Catholic opposition. It is believed that those three interests of organized society are endangered by the socialist movement. I am not familiar enough with anti-socialistic literature which may have been formally issued by Protestant churches to know exactly the motive on which non-Catholic opposition to Socialism rests. It seems that a considerable number of ministers are more or less favorable to the movement. A proposal was

made recently in the German Reichstag to unite Catholics and Protestants against Socialists on the general ground of national defence against a common danger. Employers seem to oppose Socialism because it threatens industrial progress, personal liberty, and property rights. Labor unions which oppose it do so because it tends to lead to political party organization. They are fearful of this, since the history of labor parties in the United States is one of disaster. Scholars who oppose Socialism are governed largely by academic considerations, which are but poorly appreciated, if, indeed, even known to the classes to which Socialism makes most direct appeal. There is, however, among these opponents of the movement an agreement in tone and spirit which allows us to see fairly well the essential features of the opposition. It may not be without interest to review in few words some of the arguments met.

The favorite argument is that of impossibility. We hear it said every day: "If men were angels, Socialism would succeed. It supposes perfect men and women, but we have no such race. Hence, Socialism is an idle dream." This consideration appeals with some force to those who do not need it; to shrewd, practical, methodical men who would scarcely become Socialists under any circumstances. One who is temperamentally inclined to Socialism will probably not be much influenced by it. It is not primarily belief in the possibility of Socialism that is making Socialists. On the constructive side, it is a matter of unquestioning faith. The determined Socialists, as far at least as one can know them, are as little concerned with the details of their earthly heaven as are Christians with the details of future happiness in the heaven beyond. It is a question of faith. And furthermore, as regards non-socialists, particularly those who are somewhat inclined toward Socialism, one will scarcely find in the mental process by which they become Socialists, that belief in the possibility of the socialistic state was a factor of very great importance. Where it does enter, the imagination is active enough to make anything seem possible. Protest, despair, resentment, generated spontaneously or by radical propaganda, commence the process of socialist-making, and unlimited, unquestioning faith completes it. To direct an adverse argument to the point where a process ends is not good method.

We find frequently in Socialist papers questions from Socialists who ask how this or that will be done. The answer made is generally to the effect that the present duty of Socialists is to obtain power and mastery; things will arrange themselves when the time comes. Those who urge this argument of impossibility sometimes appear to promise in place of Socialism, reforms, awakenings of social conscience, improvement in morals and government, which are themselves extremely difficult of realization, or maybe impossible from the standpoint of present-day conditions.

One may well ask if the argument of impossibility might not have been urged against Christianity itself in the beginning. Newman, n his letters to his nephew, Mr. Moseley (published in 1899), makes very moderate claims for Christianity's historical success; claims moderate in relation to the content of Christ's wonderful and appealing revelation, yet immense in relation to the world that it served, the standards that it purified, and the nobility that it engendered. Judged by total content, Christianity's achievement seems small; judged by actual achievement in the disordered and distracted world to which it came, Christianity's success was unparalleled. It seems well, then, to use the argument of the impossible against Socialism, with discrimination. It has value surely, but to depend on it for general resistance to Socialism's advance, would mean but failure.

Another anti-socialist argument rests on the great and appalling evils which would surely result, were Socialism introduced: liberty destroyed, progress endangered, justice confused, freedom of conscience threatened, monotonous servitude to an omnipotent State. I believe firmly that some such conditions might result. But how can we be sure that they would be greater than the evils from which we suffer to-day. If we place ourselves near to the suffering classes in sympathy, where hopelessness is the dominant note, we quickly discover that this argument has only moderate value against Socialism. The cry that Marx, in 1848, sent out over the world like a whip to sting men into rebellion, is heard and is read to-day with undiminished effect. "Workingmen of all countries, unite. You have nothing to lose but your chains: you have a world to gain." When men believe that they have nothing to lose

but chains, they are reckless. When one's mind is filled with despair and one's heart is bitter with disappointment and hate, the boast of liberty now enjoyed, progress insured and freedom of conscience protected, has little in it to attract or soothe one. This is the prevailing temper among those to whom Socialism primarily appeals. We need not judge of the reasonableness of it, for we are concerned with it only as affecting an argument. If one test civilization by what it does for one personally and for those that one loves, the victims of a civilization will scarcely be held to support it because we tell them of blessings that others enjoy. The motto of one Socialist paper "For the ownership of earth and the fulness thereof by all the people and not by part of the people," makes an impression on the so-called "exploited" which is far more powerful than is their fear that they who now have little, may in a socialistic state lose much. Hence, the argument drawn from the social dangers in Socialism would primarily appeal to those who are favored in present conditions—those who have position, power, success; those, in a word, who have something to lose. It has not much value in hindering the development of Socialism among those who have nothing to lose, or who believe that they have not. But it is the latter class and not the former in which Socialism thrives.

Some think it wise to resort to ridicule, denunciation, and abuse in opposing Socialism. We see and hear fantastic appeals to our sense of humor, caricature, extravagant descriptions of the red tape necessary in the socialistic state to get some new shade of ribbon to suit an unusual complexion. We are asked triumphantly how much wood-sawing will equal a surgical operation, how much coal-mining will represent an opera? There is really not much humor in the question. Organized society has worked out as difficult determinations before. The Socialist loses his sense of the ridiculous and of humor, because the depth of his despair destroys its very resources. At any rate, there is little that is wise, scholarly, or tactful, in such a line of speech, and there is no comic possibility of Socialism which is not matched by a pathetic and tragic reality from everyday life about us. And Socialists are bright enough to take advantage of the situation promptly. This method of dealing with Socialism seems to be due to a

superficial appreciation of it. Some seem to think that it is the arbitrary creation of demagogues; artificial revolt against law and order. Hence they appear to think that accuracy, fairness, intelligence, honesty, are not called for in dealing with Socialists. The movement is natural, necessary, and at present indestructible. It is not in its initial impulse the mere creation of an insane hatred of society or of peace, nor does such hatred belong essentially to its later development, though often found in it. Socialism merits very careful study, accurate, serious presentation and perfect fairness in argument. To fail in that is to fail in self-respect and scholarly honesty.

It was the custom at one time to confuse anarchy, communism, and Socialism, and hurl promiscuous condemnation at them. But not many serious opponents of Socialism do so now. Much of the opposition to Socialism rests on its alliance with free love and atheism. As far as it does attack faith in a personal God, in Christ, in the Church, and in the Christian home, every noble instinct and deeper emotion in us must be roused against it. We know that there are problems in our social life. We would wish to see religion more effective, the Church more powerful in holding society up to a higher moral level; we would wish to see purer homes and happy marriages in greater numbers; but these difficulties cannot shake our faith, or make us less watchful of most sacred institutions of our civilization. There are no facts without antecedents. We must look more deeply than to individuals, if we would understand movements in life and thought. We might find on deeper study that the antagonism against God and the home which we do find among Socialists springs from the fact that the despair which stimulates Socialism extends to religion itself. Religion has been the greatest factor in history, the strongest support of institutions as they are. The Socialist blames it for allowing abuses and misery under private ownership of capital. And the degree of blame is in direct and unjust ratio with his view of the power and prestige that religion has enjoyed. Radical reformers—as far as press and speeches and conversation represent them—blame religion for what has not been done, while we defend it for what it has done. Among all of the mistakes of Socialists, this is the most inexcusable, the most unjust toward the

Church. We who believe in Church and home must resent this injustice of Socialism's attitude toward them, and denounce the fault of method by which that attitude is supported, as well as the spirit which inspires it. Yet we could learn much by analyzing the deeper relations between Socialism and religion; there is often more to be gained by understanding than by condemning. As long as men remain more attached to Church and home than to personal progress and material comfort, this type of Socialism will be successfully opposed by exposing its irreligious character. But in distress or in discontent, be these real or imaginary, one's scale of values may be modified. If men test religion by human standards, they lose faith. When they do, irreligious socialism wins many followers. However, men may cling with determination to their faith, and discover that Socialism is not necessarily in conflict with Christianity. They then construct a coherent view of both, and remain Christians and Socialists. For this large class—larger, surely, than the other in the United States—there is practically no value in the argument of irreligion.

Some are inclined to think that the decrees issued by the Catholic Church may suffice to check Socialism, especially among Catholics. One hears non-Catholics remark that only the Church can successfully oppose the movement. The loyalty of Catholics to Church authority is surely great, but it would not be wise to test it too far. Illustration is not lacking to show that Socialism can establish itself pretty strongly in a Catholic community without apparent effect on its religious life. Pronouncements, decrees, sermons, and lectures are necessary. Resolutions such as those passed by the last convention of the American Federation of Catholic Societies are most useful, for they guide in advance and answer by anticipation thousands who look to leadership for a certain kind of direction. But no wise leader will for a moment suppose that the Church and her representatives need go no farther. Such formal action, unsupported by actual personal, intelligent influence on life and on reform, will fail of very important results. It is worthy of the practical judgment of Leo XIII that we find in his great Encyclical many times as much thought and space given to the outline of a plan of reform as is given to the condemnation of Socialism. This is an example to be followed.

Value is attached to technical economic argument against the Socialistic theory of value, or the system of Marx. This is, of course, very useful in a lecture room and among thinkers, but not among the masses. There are few technical propositions current. It is said commonly that labor produces value, that the earnings of capital are filched from labor, that labor's product should belong to labor; but back of these there is little economic reasoning. The process that brought the minds of laboring men to this position was not one of subtle analysis and careful induction, but, rather, the experience of life.

Some reliance is placed on careful study of the trend of industry. This shows in presentations made against Socialism and also against labor unions, that the earnings of labor are increasing and that those of capital are decreasing; that the standard of life for laborers is rising and that the cost of living does not increase out of proportion with the rate of wages. Argument of this kind when amply supported is certainly very strong in itself, as it should appeal ordinarily to the greater number of sensible, concrete, industrious men. But unfortunately the discontented are inclined to judge the present by future possibilities rather than by past facts, and they estimate tendencies by their outcome, not by their inception. Compared with the fourteen-hour day of some years ago, the nine-hour day is short; but the nine-hour day seems long when one thinks of a three-hour day that may come. And in the Socialist propaganda we hear of the three-hour day to come, not of the fourteen-hour day past. Yielding to this inclination, Socialism has cut loose from the basis of accurately determined fact and has become a mass of idealism, feeling, emotion, stimulated carefully and strengthened by reference to occasional typical facts. An employer did thus and so; a laborer was treated thus and so; D owns so many millions, and A owns nothing. Six current Socialist weeklies just looked through, show this to be the method employed, as in fact any student of Socialism knows. The fate of the lazy, improvident, intemperate is no sure test of a civilization, while the fate of the industrious, sober, provident, and of the weak and helpless is the surest test. The Socialist propaganda does not discriminate. It appeals generally to an established sentiment which clings no longer to definite facts. Hobson in his *John*

Ruskin Social Reformer, gives us a rule that ought to serve well in all social study: "The discovery of social truth should be conducted by a solemn marshalling of the several orders of concrete phenomena, and their formal interpretation by the application of laws based upon inductive reasoning and expressed in carefully defined terminology; the teaching of such truth should be conducted by a steady pressure of closely consecutive reasoning, a syllogistic uncoiling of propositions which shall insert or insinuate them into a vacantly receptive understanding in one continuous line" (p. 334.) I quote the words, not because I believe that it is possible or even desirable to hold all social teaching apart from our emotional nature, but to set up an extreme opposite to the Socialistic method, from which contrast one may see the error of method committed by Socialism in paying too little heed to actual statistical knowledge. This phase of the socialistic temperament is important. When one has no appetite for facts, one is not allured by them. It is useless to try to combat Socialism by statistics.

We have, then, in this summary some of the lines of argument resorted to to check Socialism. Is the opposition succeeding? States oppose it with organized energy, yet it grows. Churches resist it, and it does not weaken. Professors teach to refute it, while it thrives in non-academic circles. Labor unions fight it, yet they are permeated with it to the extent that any important convention may run the risk of being conquered by it. Employers oppose it, yet they seem to admit its persistent strength. Offspring of a strange combination of despair and idealism, and lodged in hearts and minds of men and women who have apparently no power but that of numbers, no prestige but that of humanity, no culture but that that struggle gives, and no education but that of the workshop or newspaper, it is drawing together from varied sources, power of thought, feeling and organization that terrify the governing elements of modern society and challenge the very axioms of our moral and social life. The threatening determination and persistent advance of present-day Socialism pay little tribute to the merit of the opposition that it meets. Baron von Kardoff was quoted in the press dispatches a month ago as having said in the German Reichstag in the course

of a bitter denunciation of Socialism, "We are on an express train which is rolling with wind velocity into the socialized state of the future." He proposed the withdrawal of suffrage for five years from the Socialists as a measure to exterminate them. Germany tried similar tactics in 1878 to 1890, with only favorable results for Socialism.

No doubt opposition to Socialism along the lines described has made its advance more difficult. But to assume that any one or all together of the arguments referred to will effectively hinder Socialism's advance would be to devote one's self to a delusion which is as inexcusable in origin as it would be disastrous in result. Socialism is honeycombed with error in principle, in method and in assumption, and is fraught with grave dangers. But only an opponent believes or sees this. The great unconvinced masses do not as a rule investigate according to set methods of logic. They have their own standards. The adherent of Socialism is presumably as honest as the opponent. Since each insists on including in his definition of Socialism an ethical judgment about its merit and truth, the two may never agree on a definition, as Flint remarks (*Agnosticism*, pp. 16, 17). To point out errors in Socialism serves its opponents who do not need that aid; it does not much affect the believer whose mind is already fixed; nor is it adequate to hinder the masses from becoming Socialists. For, their doing so does not depend so much on the truth or error of a system as on processes of thought and feeling which are controlled largely by their environment. As before remarked, the Socialist propagandist begins by destroying confidence in our institutions. He lectures to the victims of these institutions about the failure of them; that he has abundant material for illustration no one can deny. The net advance of Socialism over all of the opposition that it has met and is meeting, is a striking commentary on the value of methods used against it.

The intention of this presentation has been to show that in fact and in promise Socialism is very strong. No effort to minimize it a particle has been made. The purpose has been to show that argument of any kind has only secondary value against it, and that the arguments ordinarily made against it are relied upon too much. This does not imply that these are not in them-

selves true. I believe that they are true. But they do not in fact equip the minds of the masses with armor to resist the advance of Socialism. The masses are not concerned primarily with the true and the false; their own comfort and contentment is their test of democratic institutions. By this test, too, they formulate their principles of distributive justice.

It seems that there is but one way to meet Socialism. We must prove that *it is not necessary*. The proof must be in achievement, not in argument; in life, and not in books. Despair is the gate through which the threatening army comes. It must be closed. Social Reform alone can close it. The powers of society must realize their duty. Church and State, employer and laborer, court-legislation, executive and individual, must bring conscience, intelligence, and sacrifice to the task. If society *will not* give to the discontented the reasonable reform needed, it merits the punishment that Socialism can inflict. If society, as it stands, *cannot* insure those reforms, it is bankrupt, and Socialism's fundamental assumption is true. If society *does not* give us these reforms, opposition to Socialism only delays its relative triumph. The best way to educate public opinion into this view, if it be correct, is to admit the futility of verbal argument against Socialism, in the face of facts which seem to argue for it, and to set to work to coördinate the forces of society on the work of reform.

William J. Kerby.

Catholic University, Washington, D. C.

PARSIFAL.

The Religious Theme in the Drama.

IT must be plain to everyone that something more has been going on of late in the operatic world than simply an almost unprecedented furor over things theatrical, brought about through the performance of "Parsifal" in this country.

The astonishing notoriety that has overtaken this opera is first of all due to the sagacity and business enterprise of its managers; but this would have carried it only a short distance toward the magnificent business success it has achieved, if there had not been

a peculiar and unusual quality in the interest of the public mind regarding the character of "Parsifal" itself. It was this interest that made capital for the managers; and they have had, so to speak, a "corner" in it for the time being; for it was of a grade and quality not often sought or cultivated by theatrical managers.

For the time being it was assumed that a striking departure from ordinary theatrical themes, motives and characteristics, in almost every respect, had been made in the presentation of this "Sacred Festival Play:" it had no love theme, that could properly be called so in a human sense; its motive was the sacred strain of religious ecstasy; its characteristics throughout, from the first solemn prelude of the orchestra to the awe-inspiring climax in the final scene, were plainly designed to provoke religious sentiment or emotion in the audience; and if they failed to do this, plainly then does Wagner's last great work fall far short of all his others in realizing the main purpose for which it was written; though at present the managers' receipts would seem to prove the contrary to this.

It was mainly through the successful assumption that the opera actually would inspire the religious emotion it was designed to by the composer, that the material results of its presentation were achieved, and are still being reaped. This is the peculiar and unusual quality in the public's interest that has been "cornered" by the managers. As a rule, managers set out to reap results from public interest by making an appeal to almost every emotion known to human nature but the religious one. This is why the managers of "Parsifal" were able to "corner" a quantity, besides a quality in public interest, that but rarely falls to the lot of even the most enterprising of their profession.

But our interest is in the success of "Parsifal" itself as Wagner designed it, rather than in the opera as Mr. Conried and his assistants managed it. Wagner's critics, friends and foes alike, have discussed thoroughly and strenuously from platform, pulpit, and press, almost every conceivable characteristic of "Parsifal," musical, dramatic, scenic, "religious," symbolic, and ethical; while all the time the really vital and interesting thing to those who have been watching it: the motive of interest in the public mind, seems to have been overlooked. It does not vitally matter

much now that the interest itself was created, except to those who have profited materially by it; but it still matters a good deal how the motive of this interest has been affected. It is assumed that the majority of those who were led by this motive to be present at "Parsifal" expected or wanted to experience the pleasure of a strong appeal through ear, eye, and imagination, to that fine religious sentiment which forms the theme of this composition.

Few could have gone expecting anything different from this, for the opera had been too widely advertised for what it really is beforehand. Nothing in the world can attract a greater audience than an announcement that an appeal to the religious sentiments is to be made through some extraordinary and unusual medium; as everyone knows who has made any observations or analyses of those instincts that gather human beings into crowds. And as nothing will gather an audience quicker, so nothing will sway it more readily than this.

But the interesting question in the case of this latest notable gathering from such a motive is, did the audience get the thrill it came for? As far as eye, ear, and imagination could go toward producing it, the thrill was certainly a success. But anyone who would seriously say or think that "Parsifal" could produce a genuine religious emotion must surely be condoned with for the limited extent of his religious experiences.

Yet, why could not this "Sacred Festival Play," with all its perfect simulation and expression of the highest, holiest, most awe-inspiring emotions and experiences of the religious nature, bow down the souls of those who heard and saw it, with a sense of the supernatural, with a feeling of veneration, love, and loyalty toward the "Sacred Presence" implied and depicted in its mysterious symbols, uttered in its most exquisite strains, expressed in its most magnificent pictures? Because the one thing in life that cannot be successfully imitated is religious emotion; and for this reason religious emotion on the stage is out of its element, and usually a failure. If it were genuine, the stage would be the last place in the world on which it would wish to display itself; and the more perfect the imitation of it the greater the offence it gives to the instinctive respect and reverence in man's nature, both toward his own religious emotions, and toward the object of them, what-

ever that may be, from the fetish of the heathen to the Deity of the Christian.

The question, therefore, whether symbolism of sacred things, and simulation of religious emotions should be tolerated when they assume such realism as they seem to have done to some in "Parsifal," is of futile consideration. It is not the realism that offends those who become offended, but the imitation itself. Why should it be less an offence to present these things with less realism? The objection to the opera on this score is surely a childish one, not to speak of an illogical one. It merely makes the criticism that the imagination is more tricked by appearances in one case than in the other. To what faculties of the soul does the belief in the sacred mysteries supposed to be symbolized in "Parsifal" belong? We cannot help inferring from some of the objections offered in the public press, and quoted from some of the pulpits of late against the presentation of these symbols on the stage, that the belief in the sacred mysteries themselves was admitted to be merely a thing of imagination suggested and sustained by symbolism; for many of these criticisms were made against what, to these persons, was the realism of these symbols, rather than against any real affront to a belief in the mysteries themselves. To any Catholic the form of symbolism or ceremony employed here was as untrue, as unhistorical, and as spurious as any Pagan or Protestant rite could be, even were it used in all seriousness and not on the stage at all, in imitation of the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass and reception of the Holy Eucharist. This is what would constitute the great difference in the point of view of a Catholic and a non-Catholic in criticising the opera.

In no sense, however, is this meant to imply a justification or a recommendation for presenting a strictly religious play on the stage without a religious motive in the players themselves. Any attempt at such presentation stands self-condemned, as we have seen, for the simple reason that no religious emotion that is known to be so only in appearance, could possibly please any audience; not to speak of thrilling it with the same, or with the genuine emotion itself. And if people do not go to the theatre to be moved by the emotions they see depicted there, what do they go for? The difference between their sympathy for religious emo-

tion and mere human emotion in the players is, that they know the former is, usually, not honestly felt under these circumstances, while the latter can be, and with the true artist, often is felt. This does not imply either that there are not circumstances under which an ordinary player can feel the religious emotion he is depicting. A religious motive could, and as we know, has made actors in religious plays feel and believe all they say and do, and has made their performance of religious roles on the stage a reverent and a successful thing in a sense and to a degree that the most perfect artist, acting without such a motive, could not possibly achieve.

That such a theatrical masterpiece as "Parsifal," designed with incomparable art to captivate imagination, mind, and sense with one dominating thought or idea, should not achieve its purpose, may seem a bold prognostication to make at this point, with the populace still sitting wrapt before it in dumb admiration. But anyone who goes to the performance with his honest wits about him, as well as his imagination, must see that, with all its entrancing delineation of the beauty and joy and holiness of the Christian life, its ideal of spiritual perfection, as depicted here, is a very cold thing, the last thing in the world to captivate the mind of the populace, which for the moment is under the spell of the magical transformations of scenery; the beauty of forest, field and cloudland; the awe of majestic architecture; and, more than all, the enchantment of music that at moments almost seems to snatch the soul from the body in its uplift. But *this* religious emotion? *This* the ecstasy of the Christian soul captivated with a glimpse into the realms of perfect joy and peace? Small blame to the poor populace for going back to its flesh-pots in relief from the unnatural strain of such an imitation of the genuine thing. And strangely enough, as we must see, the fault does not lie in defective or imperfect imitation, but rather in the contrary. An imperfect imitation, while it might have displeased the eye and offended the ear of the audience, would at least have soothed its injured sense of the fitness of things by an implied avowal that, after all, the imitation was at best that and no more. It was the almost perfect setting of the whole thing in every detail of music, scenery, and acting, that put the strain upon the audiences present at it. They

felt debarred from criticism or protest for this very reason. How could they help being reverent before this simulation of reverence, pious before such prayerful scenes; moved by such passionate outbursts of repentance and supplication? The solemn march of the gray-robed knights in the procession of the Holy Grail seemed almost celestial in its beautiful expression of reverent love toward the symbol borne before; the chanting of unseen choristers blending with the sonorous voices of the knights in a soul-melting harmony, and carrying their feet with rhythmic tread through the long galleries of their hallowed temple, and back and forth before the sacred shrine with a more than human grace and charm. It is no wonder the people felt helpless before the contradiction offered by their pleased senses and imaginations, and their honest religious instincts; the "higher critics" only helping to confound still more the confusion already in their minds by offering explanations of Wagner's motives, mysticism, and meanings, that even an expert psychologist might be staggered by.

The whole discussion from beginning to end has resulted in a bad mix-up in the public mind of the normal and accepted classification of opinions and standards regarding the place and function of the drama as an agency for religious culture, and the obligations of those who guide or influence the public mind by upholding the true and condemning the false.

Why such primary principles as these we have been considering should, for the most part, have been left obscured or undefined in the discussion, seems indeed strange. And yet there is one reflection to comfort us for this neglect, and this is, it makes one more than ever in love with that innate honesty of instinct in human nature that knows the true when it meets it just as surely as it detects the false, though it may not afterwards live up to the conduct which this instinct prompts.

Another singular fact in the history of this notable opera and its influence upon the religious instincts of the public is, that "Parsifal" itself, as it is written by Wagner, can and does teach a magnificent moral and spiritual truth; delineates an ideal of human perfection that instinctively provokes admiration and sincere reverence in the minds of those to whom it is presented. Yet this is when the ideal is presented to the mind, not to the senses and the

imagination only, as in the case of its presentation on the stage. In one case, the element of *imitation* of the ideal destroys its effect upon the mind; in the other, the element of admiration of the ideal, as it is sincerely conceived by the imagination itself, makes it acceptable and pleasing to the mind, and induces honest emulation, not mere imitation, of the spiritual and moral lessons it teaches. Some of those who have been engaged in lecturing on, or interpreting and explaining "Parsifal" to the public of late, have testified to the keen interest and delighted appreciation of their audiences in regard to this spiritual ideal in "Parsifal;" an interest and an appreciation of undoubtedly different character than they felt who were present at the opera itself. The former class of auditors probably heard what they had anticipated in listening to a rendition, either in music or speech, of this wonderful composition of Wagner's. The latter class of auditors did not get what doubtless many among them came for: a profound impression upon their religious emotions; but they got without stint that which they should have come for when they sought entertainment of Wagner in grand opera: a splendid panorama of scenery, an imposing array of beauty in every form, enthralling music, human emotions depicted with consummate art in every tone and gesture of the actors; and all that perfect imitation could express of the ecstasy of both soul and sense in human experience. But the one touch of nature that would have made audience and actor akin was lacking here; there was no sympathy communicated from one to the other from the assumption of that religious emotion which formed the main theme of the drama. Those who have witnessed both declare that this is and must be the essential difference between the acting of the Bavarian peasant in the play at Oberammergau and the highly cultivated art of the actors from Bayreuth, whom we have with us in the performance of "Parsifal."

Another distinction that seems to have been overlooked in the heat of the discussion about this opera and about religious drama in general, is, that the representation on the stage of emotion which expresses simply the moral sentiment of love of virtue and abhorrence of sin, is a very different kind of thing from an imitation of that supreme act of man's nature which is expressed in the

worship of God; the imitation of which, at any time, or in any place, is surely blasphemous. If we have a commandment which prohibits the use of even the name of God in a thoughtless and irreverent manner, we have besides and before this a commandment that exacts the worship of God Himself in a manner which excludes and prohibits the very thought of mimicry or insincerity from so holy an act.

On account of this distinction, a morality play is a very different thing from a mystery play; and the latter classifies itself with even greater distinction still from its kind when those who perform in it are inspired with a religious motive in doing so, and when they are moved only by the motive of the stage actor and nothing more.

The point that has saved "Parsifal" from the ban of sacrilege, while apparently a mere technical one, is unquestionably a true one. There is really no performance, nor the imitation of any performance of this act of worship toward God throughout the opera. There is much worshipping of symbols, of reverent posturing and solemn gesturing before them; but they are mere symbols, and found to be, after careful investigation and inquiry, so vague in their real reference to the things they appear to represent, that they might just as well be taken for lighted joss-sticks in a Chinese temple, as the altar lamps or sacred vessels used in a true Christian ceremonial. That is, the representation of them that is given on the stage impresses one in this way, though the reading of the opera itself would perhaps lead one to expect a wholly different impression of them. But how anyone could be impressed with the similarity between the artificial ceremony of the knights of the Holy Grail, and the services on a true Christian altar, is a psychological problem.

There is, at times, a certain infantile disposition of the imagination that would lead us into a perfect revel of the unreal as suggested to us through the senses, making us ignore for the moment everything that reason would suggest in its effort to break the spell. In such a state of mind might a spectator be impressed by the magic tricks of transformation in the climatic scene of "Parsifal," when the "Sacred Cup" breaks into a refulgent glow of red light, and the flaming dove descends upon the chosen few gathered

about the holy table. But the illusion of it all is too mechanical to impress any but the most childish imagination, though the artistic effects might please the most fastidious and matured. While the eye was admiring these effects, the minds of most of the intelligent persons there present were probably engaged, sub-consciously anyhow, on the man at the switch-board who was controlling the electrical devices that so cunningly produced these marvellous results of light and color, more instant and illusionary than any magician of old ever dreamed of attempting in his most subtle manipulation of "the black art."

But far from any serious suggestion of the supernatural were all these artificial effects of theatricalism. Not only did they fail in their delineation of any truly supernatural idea, but even the spiritual ideal embodied in the opera of "Parsifal" itself was sadly misrepresented through them. The virgin life, the practice of asceticism, the renunciation of the world, the flesh, and the devil, as conditions necessary for attaining the spiritual vision, were not depicted here in a manner that would make anyone fall in love with such an ideal, but rather in a way that would chill and repel. And yet it is the most beautiful idea in the world, and one that has actually in real life inspired the noblest minds, urged to the most heroic deeds, and won the warmest hearts to its service and its realization.

Who could be chilled by the conception of it conveyed by Tennyson through his Idylls of the King, or by any of those noble Arthurian legends that even in this prosaic age awaken a throb of heroic sentiment of the finest kind in the hearts of those who read them? In "Parsifal," too, anyone with spiritual sensibility cannot but feel the inspiration of this lofty conception of human virtue: that beautiful idea of innocence or guilelessness proving invincible in its encounter with evil: "Parsifal," the "pure fool," stumbling into the very arms of sin and coming out unscathed because he thought no evil in his heart:—Wagner touched a height of mystic truth in that idea that might have comprehended the sum of all human aspirations after spiritual perfection, if rightly interpreted. The flaw in his interpretation of it is his introduction of an artificial religiousness as a setting for the idea; which was a perfect conception in itself, and needed no such embellishment as

this setting gives it. But Wagner had to have some object toward which to direct the aspirations of his hero. For the reasons already considered he could not have introduced any tangible idea of God; so, out of vague traditions, stories, and legends, he wrought a symbol which would serve his purpose.

The only harm done by his achievement is caused through misunderstanding or misinterpretation of it for the most part. Let the symbolism of the opera be rejected as having no serious or definite religious significance, and accepted only as an adjunct, a stage makeshift for the setting up of the idea of "Parsifal," and no more fault can be found with Wagner's use of such symbolism than with his use of any other accessory of the stage.

The good done by the presentation of this opera must, in any event, far outweigh the possible harm caused through the misunderstanding about it; even though some of this good may be only of a negative sort by demonstrating that, while the stage can do good missionary work by teaching morality through the drama, it could be nothing but a failure if it presumed to trespass upon the sacred precincts of the sanctuary in any serious representation of Christian worship; unless its motive for doing so were religious instead of merely theatrical.

Much will be gained through the event of the performance of "Parsifal" in this country, and the furor it has occasioned, if it brings the public mind a little nearer to the settlement of so vital a question as this: There is no proper substitute for the temple of God in which man may offer the homage of his soul and the love and loyalty of his heart in the supreme act of human life: worship of the Supreme Being; and those who would offer or approve the substitution of other places, other times and other forms in which and through which to express this homage of man to his Creator—and it is one of the saddest errors of our day to discount and disparage the Church as the best place for religious worship—are doing a most unholy thing toward God, and a most unhuman thing toward man. His temple to the living God is as dear a thing to the heart of man, and as deeply rooted in his primitive instincts, as the shrines of his country and the sacred altar of his home.

A. A. McGinley.

New York City.

THE AMBROSIAN RITE AT MILAN.[1]

AMONG the thousands who flock annually to the world-famed Duomo of Milan, there must be many who carry away with them the impression of the quaint singularity of the Rite associated with the name of St. Ambrose, that remains as striking a feature of the Cathedral as any part of its material fabric. It would be difficult to realize the loss to religious associations were the Ritual of the Mass and of the Divine Office at Milan Cathedral made conformable to the rules of Western Christendom; the *ethos*, or peculiar genius, or spirit, that invests places as well as societies of living men with a separate individuality—that "spirit of place" would be radically changed if the Sacred Rites of over a thousand years were abandoned for the sake of greater organic unity.

But not only does the Ambrosian Rite stamp itself no less indelibly upon the memory than the grand stretch of white marble, glistening in the warm Italian sunlight, or beneath the soft rays of a summer moon, topped by innumerable pinnacles, that is its tabernacle and shrine; it remains a solitary relic of rites, once as ancient as itself, that have long since perished. Gallican, Gothic, Spanish, Mozambique Rites have all had to give way before the desire for uniformity in liturgies as well as in government that has made Rome the model and mistress of all Churches: Milan alone has retained in spite of cycles of change, revolutions in Church and State, the rise and fall of dynasties, and the centralization of ecclesiastical authority, her right to a peculiar ritual alike in her Missal and in her Breviary.

It is the purpose of the present paper to trace, in a popular way, the origin of this unique and most characteristic feature of the Cathedral of Milan (one of the largest buildings and grandest works of art in the world), and to sketch briefly its several parts.

Like the Cathedral, whose architecture has been ascribed by some to Harler and Gammodia, by others—to whom it seems plain that the building was already advanced when these great

[1] The writer wishes to express his acknowledgment of the courtesy of the Right Reverend Abbot Bergh, O.S.B., of Ramsgate Abbey, England, in supplying him with much valuable information on the subject of his paper.

geniuses arrived in Milan—to Marco Frisone da Campione, the Liturgy has its beginnings hazy, through the mists of antiquity.

There is little room for doubt that as far back as the fifth century, the age of St. Ambrose, the Milanese celebrated Mass and chanted their offices with, practically speaking, the same ritual as they do to-day in the twentieth century. And thus the form of ceremonial which impresses all who worship in the Cathedral comes a long way down the ages of the Church. It is now practically certain that St. Ambrose is not the founder of the Rite which bears his name, although he certainly enriched it, purified it from Arian innovations, and generally adapted it to the requirements of his age. The full details of the celebrated controversy concerning the rival claims of East and West to be the place of its actual origin, are of more interest to the liturgiological expert than to the ordinary reader. We may, however, note that many characteristic Oriental features are to be observed in the wording of the prayers (not to speak of the *Kyrie eleison*) and in the actual ceremonial, which would seem to point to an influence from the East. It is now, however, generally accepted that the Ambrosian Rite is, in substance at all events, the ancient form of the Roman Rite,[2] or, in other words, the changes and developments from time to time effected in the Roman Church, were not adopted at Milan. Take, for example, the Canon of the Mass. This central element of all Catholic liturgies is identical at Milan and Rome: it is in minor matters that we detect small differences. For example, at Milan, Mass is said *sotto voce*, so as not to be heard by the people. The most remarkable variants from the Roman Rite in the structural part of the Mass are as follow:

1. In the introductory part of the Mass there were always two lessons—one taken from the Old, and one from the New Testament, each followed by its own Gradual. The Roman Liturgy dropped the first of these, and the two Graduals were united; hence the composite chant which appears at the end of the Epistle in the Roman Mass of to-day. But the Milanese still

[2] See Mr. Edmund Bishop, one of the best living authorities on liturgiology, *The Genius of the Roman Rite* (1902), p. 5, where he views "the Ambrosian Rite as really Roman at bottom."

retain the old Collect *over the corporal* after the *Dominus vobiscum* of the Offertory.[3] Mr. Edmund Bishop gives an interesting account of the original purpose of this initial act of the old Roman Mass called in modern rubrics "the unfolding of the corporal." "I fear," he writes, "I should shock my readers were I to use the expression of our common parlance, 'spreading the table cloth'; and yet this is the term which exactly corresponds to what is prescribed in the earliest extant Roman rubrics. In those days a corporal was a cloth large enough to cover the altar. An acolyte stands holding the chalice with the corporal laid upon it; he hands the corporal to a deacon, who, with another deacon, mounts to the altar, one standing at either end; the deacon begins to unfold the corporal, throws one end of it to the other deacon, and so they spread it over the altar; just what may be seen done any day in the laying of a tablecloth."[4] Mr. Bishop proceeds to disclaim the note of "homeliness" which seems *prima facie* to characterize this act. "What is called 'homeliness' of any kind," he writes, "is the very last quality I should be disposed to predicate of the true Roman rite. The true Roman cannot forget his dignity. [The act of spreading the corporal] is only and simply practical; the thing had to be done, and was done in a plain and simple, but the most practical manner" (p. 19). It should also be noted that up to the present day the two preliminary lessons are read from the marble ambos to the right and left of the chancel, that at once catch and arrest the eye, as one enters the vast nave of the Cathedral.

2. In the Roman Rite the celebrant says *Oremus*, only omitting the subsequent prayer.

3. Another curious point of distinction is that the Milanese never say the nine-fold *Kyrie*, as is the custom generally in the West. They leave out *Christe eleison* entirely, and repeat *Kyrie eleison* nine times, *not* in succession, but three times after the *Gloria*, three times after the Gospel, and three times at the conclusion of the Mass.

[3] *Cf.* Mr. Edmund Bishop (*op. cit.*, p. 32, note): "There seems a really strong presumption that the prayer still to be found in the Ambrosian Missal called 'Super sindonem' did form an item of the early Roman Mass."

[4] *Ibid.* pp., 18–19.

4. The Creed, too, is recited, *not* after the Gospel, but immediately before the Preface.

5. Perhaps many will find more interesting the very ancient custom of the people themselves really offering the Bread and Wine at the Offertory—still preserved at Milan. On solemn days, such as the one on which it was recently the writer's privilege to assist at the Holy Sacrifice in the Cathedral at Milan, this striking feature was extremely picturesque and impressive. Four old men, and as many aged women, go up in groups to the altar in procession, where the celebrant receives from them a sufficiency of bread and wine. It is, however, we believe, a fact, that the bread is not actually used for the Holy Sacrifice—although the wine is so used.

6. St. Gregory, M., about the year 600[5] postponed in the Roman Rite the breaking of the Sacred Host until after the *Pater Noster*. This change was not adopted at Milan.

To turn to other peculiarities. The assistance of the deacon and sub-deacon is wholly different from that to which we are usually accustomed in the West. During a part of the Mass, they leave the celebrant and kneel facing each other at the north and the south end of the altar. The sequence of liturgical colors, too, is strikingly unfamiliar. Thus, black vestments are worn on all ferials in Lent, but *red* in Holy Week (the last three days included). On Easter Day, and during its Octave, *white* is used; but on Low Sunday and during the remainder of Paschaltide, *green* takes its place. Corpus Christi and ordinary Sundays after Pentecost have *red*. For St. Anne and other holy women, neither Virgins nor Martyrs, the rubrical color is violet.

One of the most remarkable and at the same time interesting survivals of ancient discipline at Milan[6] is that all Fridays during Lent are observed as Good Friday is by the rest of the Catholic Church, *i. e.*, without any Mass at all. It is but a few years ago that the Cardinal Archbishop of Milan obtained permission from

[5] St. Gregory the Great introduced this change into the Missal, commonly called "Gregorian." According to Mr. Edmund Bishop (*op. cit.*, p. 25), this is the Missal "which alone we certainly know to have been in actual use in Rome at the very close of the eighth century."

[6] The same custom prevails throughout the East in the case of both the Schismatic and Uniat Churches.

Rome with some difficulty for a celebration of the Holy Eucharist on the Feasts of St. Joseph and of the Annunciation when either of these days should fall on a Friday. For, in general, the Ambrosian Rite refuses to celebrate any Feast in Lent—the Mass and Office are invariably of the ferial. They have no Ash Wednesday; Lent with its offices and fasts begins on the following Sunday. The Holy Week services are strange indeed to the pilgrim from other quarters of Christendom. Hymns, Glorias, and the like go on as before: there is no Tenebrae service; the Passion according to St. Matthew is read at Mass—half on Maundy Thursday, half on Good Friday. The other Passions are read, one after the other, on Good Friday, not at Mass but in the Office. On Good Friday itself, after the reading of the Passion, the altars are stripped, and the candles extinguished. On Maundy Thursday the Blessed Sacrament is carried in procession to the Sepulchre, *i. e.*, the altar of repose, as in the Roman Rite; but on Good Friday there is no returning with It to the altar, since on that day not even the celebrant communicates with the Pre-sanctified Host. The *Adoration* takes place in much the same way as elsewhere throughout the West—save that the Crucifix is uncovered.

The Holy Saturday ceremonies remind one much more of the Roman Rite in its present form. There is the customary Blessing of Fire, Incense, and the Paschal Candle, and the long ceremony at the Font, while the Mass of the day begins with the bringing back in procession of the Holy Sacrament from the altar of repose. The *Gloria in Excelsis*, however, is not sung at the Mass of Holy Saturday; but the celebrant thrice chants "Christ our Lord has risen," whereupon the bells are rung and the organ's majestic and joyful strain fills the building, proclaiming to the faithful the glad tidings of the Resurrection.

The difference between the Roman and Milanese Breviaries is so slight that it need not long detain us. It is confined, roughly speaking, to the offices of Vespers and of Compline. Ambrosian Vespers is not so unlike the present use of Rome as many of their other offices. On Sundays they begin with the *Dominus vobiscum*: followed by the *Chant at the Lighting of Lamps*, then the Vesper hymn followed by the ordinary five psalms with their antiphons. A collect takes the place of the

little Chapter, and the *Magnificat*, with its proper antiphon, is sung, with one or more collects following.

Ambrosian Compline only differs from the ordinary form in that there is no *Confiteor* or other introduction, and that the hymn comes before the Psalms. At the conclusion of the Office there is an antiphon of Our Lady, and before leaving the Choir, or Sanctuary, the clergy say the *Confiteor* in place of the Roman *Pater*, *Ave*, *Credo*.

A few more general remarks in conclusion may not be out of place. And first as to the character or spirit of the Rite which we have been considering. Its prevailing note is a sober simplicity allied with a severe practicability that is much opposed to anything savoring of the sensuousness of the theatre as to an excess of poetical symbolism. We have seen this mingling of dignity with a desire to be, above all things, practical, in the unfolding of the corporal, together with its accompanying prayer. It is also illustrated by the peculiar ceremonies of the Offertory, and by the sequence of liturgical colors. We may apply to the Ambrosian Rite Mr. E. Bishop's remarks on the genius or nature of the Roman Rite from which it originally sprang. It is marked by "simplicity, practicability, a great sobriety, and self-control, gravity, and dignity."[7] We may next notice that, as is perhaps but natural, the Milanese have always been proud and jealous of their Rite, and we find that they strenuously resisted Charles the Great[8] and other secular governors, who did all that lay in their power to impose upon them the use prevailing throughout the rest of the Catholic world. A last attempt was made in the sixteenth century to conform the Ambrosian rite to the Roman for the sake of uniformity, but St. Charles Borromeo pointed out to Gregory XIII that the resentment of the people of Milan would have

[7] *Op. cit.*, p. 23.

[8] Charlemagne was fittingly dubbed "the sacristan." He made wars with the zest of a Napoleon and crowned himself like that conqueror, "Emperor of the West," but he was at heart an ecclesiastic. "Never," writes Mr. E. Bishop, "was he more pleased with himself than when he was presiding in his own chapel. . . . He enjoyed Church business of all sorts in every detail, ritual and other . . . to a mind like his the liturgical anarchy prevailing in his kingdom was intolerable, and, with his interests, the subject was sure . . . to engage his attention." (*Op. cit.*, p. 27.)

created unsurmountable difficulty against the adaptation with the result that nothing was done. Thus the Ambrosian Liturgy and Breviary passed unscathed through the changes made successively in the Roman Missal and Office Book by St. Pius V, Paul IV and Urban VIII, as well as by Gregory XIII in accordance with the reforming enactments of the Council of Trent. Those changes having for their object the end of liturgical anarchy, found, however, their counterpart in the work of St. Charles Borromeo at Milan. The sixteenth century saw the Popes busy correcting the Ritual of the Church, and reducing the Church of the West to a uniform standard of Ritual by general adoption of the revised Roman Rite. St. Charles did the same work for the diocese of Milan—a work which was completed under his successor.

The Ambrosian Rite is of obligation only in the Province of Milan, *i.e.*, in Lombardy. In Milan itself priests from other places are permitted to say their own Mass; but in Milan Cathedral none except the Ambrosian is allowed, save at the Altar of St. Charles in the crypt over the body of the Saint,—still in a marvellous state of preservation. Such, in brief, are a few facts concerning the extremely interesting and fascinating form of worship which any of our readers can witness for themselves, if ever they happen to be in Lombardy. To those who would wish to study the matter further, we would say that full and reliable information, and that most interesting to the expert ritualist (in the technical sense of the term), can be found in the following three authoritative works upon the subject: (1) *Notitia Liturgiae Ambrosianae*, ante saec. xi medium, by the Very Rev. Canon Magistretti, published by Giovanola—1895, Milan; (2) *Cenni scn. Rito Ambrosiano*, same author and publisher; (3) *Beroldus sine Eccles. Ambros. et Mediol. Kalendarium et ordines*, saec. xii, same publisher. And it is well worth while to consult *Ceremoniale Ambrosiano*, by the Rev. D. Giovannini Dozio, published by Diotta Angelli, St. Margheritta Milano.

H. Vernon Moreton.

London, England.

OUR BIBLE CLASS.

THE allusion to Händel's Oratorio, which the Professor had made in describing Miriam's song, suggested to Cousin Harry the arrangement of a concert at the Conservatory, in which some selections from *Israel in Egypt* were to be reproduced. He was enthusiastically fond of the German oratorio masters, particularly Bach and Händel, but said that, in order to produce the magnificent and exquisite effects intended by them, a full orchestral accompaniment was required.

Incidentally, we all became interested in the study of Hebrew music, which, the Professor told us, was best represented by the modern oratorio. The Psalms, as they were rendered in the Levitical service of the Jews, were always accompanied by the music of wind, string, and percussion instruments, which gave to the chant of the religious themes a dramatic effect at once solemn and attractive. He promised to tell us more on the subject as soon as we should come to the description of the ministries of the Priests and Levites in the Tabernacle.

Expressing the hope that we all had a tolerably clear picture in our minds of the site and formation of the Arabian territory east of the Red Sea which we were about to traverse under the leadership of Moses, the Professor at once began his lecture on

The Wanderings of the Israelites in the Desert.

It may be presumed that the Israelites did not tarry on the shore of the Red Sea, which they had hurriedly crossed under the wonderful protection of Yahwe. They at once continued in a southerly direction along the gulf coast. Thus they were cut off from the Egyptian hosts on the right by the waters of the Red Sea, whilst on their left the lofty mountain wall of Sur separated them from the desert region of Pharan, in which lay numerous mineral mines worked and garrisoned by Egyptian owners. It is a bleak and rocky passage, with here and there an oasis offering scanty vegetation. The traditional text of the Vulgate informs us that "they marched three days through the wilderness, and found no water. And they came into Marah."[1] But another tradition though less authenticated, is more explicit, and states that they stopped at a place somewhat further north, where they reorgan-

[1] Exod. 15 : 22.

ized their scattered hosts to prepare for the long journey to the promised land of their forefathers, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. At all events we know that they reached an oasis where they found some springs. The place in Exodus is called Marah (at present Hawarah). But the water proved to be brackish and bitter. This was discouraging, especially as the Israelites must have been thoroughly exhausted by the marches of the last few days. There is still a caravan route along this site, which probably marks the way of the Jews under the guidance of Moses. It is a hard rocky road, often too narrow to allow a number of persons to pass abreast in helpful order; and when we remember the intense heat that glares down from an unveiled sky during the larger part of the day in this region, we can form some picture of the exhausted and untrained multitude dragging their wearisome burdens along the narrow and pebbly defiles.

Thus the situation itself made continued discipline impossible, even if Moses could have been sure that his authority was capable of ordinarily controlling the fickle train of recent slaves who had not yet learnt to use their liberty with discretion. Soon the murmurings of the discontented were heard, and gradually as they grew louder, they were coupled with threats. Moses realized that the spark of an angry word might easily set on fire the minds even of those who under other less confusing circumstances would have pledged their loyalty to him as the appointed leader of Israel. Dreading the approach of the inevitable revolt, the troubled chief casts down his face upon the stony ground and prays to Yahwe: Lord, give them water.

And lo, there comes to the aged prophet a vision of a low tree, the branches of which, on being cast into the spring, take away the bitterness of its water. It is said that the Arab dwellers in this region still use a similar device for sweetening brackish waters; but whether or not, we are sure that Divine Providence showed its care of the wandering Israelites by inspiring their leader with a knowledge of an opportunity of which he might otherwise have remained ignorant.

Quieted for the moment, the Israelites were probably disposed to rest here for a time at least. Some of their scouts must have reconnoitred in the neighborhood in order to discover whatever

chance advantages the locality might offer for meeting the needs of so large a family, for we find that very shortly they moved the entire camp a few hours farther south. Here they found an oasis with abundant springs and sheltering trees, the name of which is recorded as *Elim*.

Moses had taken occasion at Marah to teach the Israelites a lesson of confidence in God, reminding them how, amid their dire need, they had unexpectedly received help. The discovery of Elim confirmed the trust with which Moses had inspired the people. The place, which is presumably the modern Gharandél, has a number of palm and tamarisk trees, and during the spring season several streamlets unite to fill the wady so that the supply of fresh water becomes unusually good in so barren a neighborhood. Here, then, they tarried contentedly after the hard experience of the last few days, and no doubt Moses utilized the opportunity to instruct and drill the vast multitude to some sort of consistent discipline which might allow him to prevent the troubles which he foresaw must inevitably be encountered before they could reach the end of their journey.

We know from the Sacred Text that the Israelites were loth to part from the "twelve wells and seventy palms." It should be mentioned that the accurate numbering here represents, according to the Hebrew fashion, merely the completeness or largeness of the benefit afforded by the shelter wherein the abundance of water and shade was to be found to satisfy all their wants for the time being.[2] They remained for a full month; and this despite the fact that all must have been eager to reach the land of Canaan—the land flowing with milk and honey, promised to them and their children; for this was the object of their journey. They felt that they were the rightful heirs of Abraham, to whom a country far richer and fairer than this Elim of the palm trees and springs in the desert, had been promised.

The road they had taken was the safest, though not of course the shortest. But it was one with which Moses was somewhat familiar since his journey to Midian. The distance to Canaan, by

[2] Both the number *twelve* and the number *seventy* express the symbolism of perfection or completeness, just as we use the expression a dozen or a hundred times, wishing simply to say "very often."

this long route, is about 400 miles. It would take them, supposing the roads were clear along the coast of Akaba and the region of Edom (Aduma), several months.

From Elim to Rephidim.

But God had other designs. A generation was to pass before the promise made to Abraham should be accomplished, and the Israelites who had left Egypt were to undergo a training that was to be a test of their virtue and a blessing to their posterity. The future, the hope of Israel, lay in the children—God Himself was to educate them in the desert for their new citizenship.

We have just seen that from the wells of Moses (*Ayun Musa*), which may, roughly speaking, be identified with Marah, the way led to Elim (Ex. 15: 27; Num. 33: 9), a spot that entices the traveller through the desert to linger beneath its shady palms, and to refresh his weary body with that most precious gift of nature —above all in the East—a draught of limpid water. The place to-day is called Wady Gharandél.

From here it was a short distance to the seashore, and from a passage in the Book of Numbers (33: 10) we may conclude that at least some of the Israelites had pitched their tents close by the sea.

Elim was to be the last comfortable resting-place for many a day to come. The Israelites had now tasted the freedom of desert life; but they had also become familiar with its difficulties and the particular defences it required during a lengthy journey. Here, then, they could make provision for their future needs, and guard against probable dangers from the climate, the roaming beasts of the desert, and those nomadic tribes that infested the regions through which the Hebrews must journey.

Their way henceforth lay inland, to the high plains of the desert. The itinerary given in the Book of Numbers (33: 12) adds several stations to those enumerated by the writer of Exodus. But the sites are uncertain.[3]

[3] *Dophka* (Raphaka), the first place mentioned after *Elim*, with its encampment at the shore, has been located (by Ebers and Rendel Harris) near the entrance to the Wady Maghara, one of the oldest Egyptian mines. The district is rich in bluestone quarries, whence the name of *Mafkah* (as the stone is called) has been given

Rephidim is situated at the entrance to a tortuous wady which for miles leads between grand cliffs to the oasis of Sinai, between the mountains which were to shelter them for almost an entire year (Num. 10: 11, and Exod. 19: 1); and here once more Yahwe would vindicate His claim to their unreserved confidence by a proof of His power and His indulgent longanimity.

The Miracles of the Quails, the Manna, and the Water.

We can readily understand how the Israelites, as they resumed their tiresome journey, would again and again yield to the temptation to murmur against Moses whenever, their provisions and water growing less, they reflected on the barren outlook around them. "Would," they said, "that we had died by the hand of Yahwe in Egypt, when we slept by the flesh pots and did eat bread in abundance; for ye have brought us to this wilderness that our lives may be consumed with hunger." God answers their complaint by a threefold miracle. "And it came to pass in the evening that quails coming up, covered the camp." It was in the month of May, the season for the migration of the quail. These birds return by slow flight from Africa and Asia to the Mediterranean shores, which they leave usually about the end of September or early in October. According to the testimony of Pliny, the bird here spoken of is long-winged and heavy. The migrating bands always fly in the direction of the wind, and frequently during the night when the currents are strongest. If the wind suddenly veers, especially at a time when the birds, coming in large swarms, are exhausted from a long flight, they settle close to the ground, waiting until the adverse wind has passed. During this time they remain almost motionless, as if benumbed, or they move about so slowly that it is easy to catch them. The inhabitants of the islands in the Greek archipelago frequently capture without difficulty thousands of these birds during their migrating periods.

to the entire country. *Alush*, the next station, would have to be sought about a day's journey beyond Dophka, or half way towards *Rephidim*. The Arabic word *El-Osh* is supposed to be a corruption for *Alush*. If so, then we have to seek the last mentioned station of the Hebrews at the head of the Wady Barek, which ends in the broad pass of *Achdar*.

It was such a flock as this that Yahwe put in the way of the famishing Israelites in answer to their clamors against Moses. Once more, later, when they had left Sinai, God wrought for them a similar miracle which, owing to the gluttonous abuse of it, wrought sickness and death among the people.[4]

But the Israelites had also asked for bread. And Yahwe replied by a miracle which for the moment roused their admiring gratitude, for they had never seen anything like it in Egypt. In the morning, as they came forth from their tents, they saw the ground of the desert far and wide covered with innumerable whitish grains, like the seed of the coriander, soft and sweet as the taste of honeyed bread. "Behold," said Moses to the astonished people, "it is *bread* which Yahwe has sent us. Gather it, as much as is enough for each one's eating." Every man was to take a certain measure for himself and for those who were with him in his tent. And thus for many a day, according to the need of the Israelites, this wonderful bread appeared for their use. It was a blessed gift indeed, for not only did it still their hunger, but it brought with it a gradual habit of order and sobriety. It was to test their sense of self-restraint and obedience. The Israelites must rise betimes in the morning to gather the allotted share for their use, and for that of their household; because, as soon as the sun had risen, this singular food melted away like snow. At the same time it held a warning for those who were disposed toward gluttony or avarice, because it was sure to corrupt when hoarded beyond the prescribed measure or time.

No little discussion has been aroused in the field of Biblical criticism regarding this miracle. On the one hand it is asserted by those who are willing to admit the Biblical miracles, that the idea of raining bread is so extravagant as to challenge our credulity. If God wished to supply the Israelites with bread, they argue, it is likely that He would do so by increasing their actual store, rather than by creating so strange a substance just for them. These critics object, *not* to the miracle, but to the *kind* of miracle. Others have denied the miraculous character of the circumstance altogether, and hold that the narrative of Exodus is an exaggerated account of an incident which is not uncommon in the Arabian countries.

[4] Num. 11 : 4–18–31 ; Ps. 78 : 26 ; *Cf.* also Ps. 105 : 40.

In answer to these two extreme opinions we have a very simple explanation which at once vindicates the miraculous character of the incident, and shows at the same time how Almighty God avails Himself, as in the case of the wonderful passage of the Red Sea, so here, of the natural elements which His eternal wisdom has prepared for our use. The Sacred Text seems to indicate that the *manna* became a steady food-supply during the entire long sojourn of the Israelites in the desert. But we need not infer that they lived exclusively by it. On the contrary, the very choice of the ground, so rich in vegetation, leads us to assume that, like the native Arabs of that region, they profited by the natural growth of the soil, which abounds in grain and root-fruits of various kinds. Their flocks found grass, and in return supplied milk and meat. The very fact that, as we shall see, they had to fight for the possession of this oasis among the mountains, seems to prove its fruitfulness, at least as compared with the desert lands around. Thus we are reasonably led to conclude that the manna simply *filled out* the need for the sustenance of so large a host, when the ordinary gifts of nature proved insufficient to provide for all.

Now as to the *manna*, it is well known to travellers that it is no unusual thing in Arabia. The Greek monks in the convent of St. Katharine, here in this very desert at the foot of Mt. Sinai, will give you to-day what they call the *mamia*, gathered at certain seasons of the year; and you may watch the Arabs collecting the grains and boiling them to a sweet paste which they use as condiment. Josephus, the historian, who clearly states the miraculous nature of the appearance of the manna, writes[5] that God still in His providence sends the same bread to the poor inhabitants of the Sinaitic desert. As a matter of fact, the small soft grains, of a sweet taste, which the Arabs make into cakes and which they call *heaven's manna*, are the product of a tree called by the natives *Tharfa*. It is an evergreen, belonging to the family of the tamarisk, with greyish bark, very small lancet-formed leaves and a deep red flower. When the fertilizing rains of the Spring-season have ceased, this plant exudes a juice which, distilled from the branches during the night, falls in little globules or drops of a creamy color,

[5] *Antiq.*, IV, 1, 6.

THE RED DOTTED LINE INDICATES ROUTE OF MOSES IN HIS FLIGHT FROM EGYPT.
THE PURPLE LINE INDICATES ROUTE OF THE ISRAELITES, UNDER THE LEADERSHIP OF MOSES, INTO THE PROMISED LAND.

and hardens. The Arabs gather it at early morn, because the heat of the sun melts the gum-like substance, and then absorbs the fluid. Its taste is sweet like honey, and when cooked it can be preserved. Some naturalists maintain that the exudation is the result of the sting of an insect which, puncturing the soft inner rind of the branches, gives an outlet for the fluid. However this be, the neighborhood of Mt. Sinai and Elim (Wadys Gharandél, Pheiran esh Sheich, and further south Nasib) abound in the tamarisk tree. The gathering of the manna by the desert natives begins in May and lasts from six to ten weeks. It is worthy of note also that the old Egyptian monuments before Moses make mention of a substance which they call *mannu*, and which from all accounts was similar to the food miraculously supplied for the Israelites.

We have the curious coincidence, then, that the *manna* came first to the Israelites at a season when the tamarisk sheds *its* manna, that is, in May. This occurs not only in the locality of which we are presently speaking; but when the *manna* is again mentioned as having been sent to the Israelites, it is exactly at the same season, a year later, in their journey northward. In the latter place it is said that the manna became the daily sustenance of the Israelites; but we know, however, from a later passage in the Book of Numbers, that subsequently the people, growing tired of the manna (Num. 21 : 5), contented themselves with the food which they obtained from the culture of the ground or purchased from the wandering tribes which they met. To the coincidence of the producing season and the name ("what is it" is probably a gloss) we must add the similarity which the *manna* of the Israelites presents to the manna of the tamarisk in *appearance*, in *taste*, in the fact that it melts under the heat of the sun, and even in this that it easily spoils if kept in the open or in a raw state.

Nor does the fact that this manna was not gathered from trees, but came in the form of a shower from heaven, present any difficulty from the naturalist's point of view. In the vast uplands of the East the wind sweeps large areas, and carries the seeds over a distance of several miles before bringing them down in showers. We have similar phenomena in the well-known blood-rains of the Canary Islands, and the rain of seeds occasionally occurring in southern Europe, or in the sulphur-rains conveying large quan-

tities of fungoid organisms from the sky. These phenomena naturalists have readily traced to the action of the whirlwinds blowing from the arid deserts of Northern Africa and in Central Asia. Even in our northern regions there have been well authenticated instances of such freaks of nature, such as the recurrence of showers of small fishes caught up from the brackish ponds near the Welsh coast. The same is witnessed in India, where at times immense quantities of these animals are carried through the air for a distance of over thirty miles.

Trustworthy naturalists state that there are other plants in the Arabian desert which yield a product that equally resembles the manna mentioned in the Sacred Text. Such is notably the so-called manna clover (*Hedysarum Alhagi L.*), very much like the dried-juice gum of the tamarisk in appearance and taste. Hasselquist states that an Abyssinian caravan of more than 1,000 persons lived upon this manna in the year 1750 for two months at a time, when, after having lost their way, they were utterly destitute of other food. This, like a similar fruit of the Great Sahara desert (*Lecanora esculenta Chlorangium Jussuffii*), is frequently carried in showers from above, like rain, so that the Arabs believe it to come down from heaven.

But when we have admitted all these phenomena as facts in nature, to which ocular observation bears witness, we have in no wise minimized the miraculous character of the event related in the Sacred Text. For whilst the occurrence of these things shows the use made probably of the products of nature by Almighty God, it does not explain the measure and precise moment which He chose to feed so immense a multitude according to their actual need. The quail passed over the camp, the manna came—when needed. As later in the New Testament our Lord used the bread and the fishes, and multiplied them miraculously, so with the Israelites God multiplied and directed the manna and the quail. He might have done otherwise, and created it all out of nothing, as He produced the water from the rock, but He need not have done so. And to realize, and be able to explain this, is an advantage in Biblical apologetics.

When we regard the attitude of the modern mind, educated in a skeptical and materialistic atmosphere, which makes the belief

in the supernatural more difficult than it was during the blessed ages of faith, we may find reason to be grateful to God for making faith less difficult to those who are willing to accept reasonable motives of credibility for the existence of a Divine Power. The man who is inclined to turn away from the belief in the Scriptural accounts because they seem to him, as he would state it, contrary to reason, must first be led to listen. When he finds that what appeared unreasonable is not contrary to reason but only above it, he is better disposed to accept the other motives of faith. No person who admits the existence of a God and of a supernatural order can urge any legitimate objection to miracles as manifestations of divine power; whilst he may reject what seems unreasonable in the light of ascertained fact.

But we must hasten on.

The last mentioned miracles happened in the region which lies west of Rephidim, and which is called the Desert of Sin. In Rephidim ("breadth," "broad plain," sometimes translated as "place of rest") they were to pitch their tents. But here new difficulties arise. The scantiness of the water supply in the Eastern deserts is proverbial. With so large a multitude as the one now under the guidance of Moses the lack of abundant drinkable water was a serious difficulty; and it became soon the cause of loud murmurings among the people. They strove in anger with Moses, and when he bade them be patient and trust the Lord who had so manifestly delivered and protected them, they cried out and were ready to stone him to death. Moses, with the meekness of a great mind, ceases from striving with an unreasonable multitude, and again turns to God in prayer. He takes his rod, and as he strikes the mountain rock against which he had leaned his troubled brow, there gushes forth a limpid stream of living water. But as the shouts of the people welcomed the miracle, Moses raised his hand and voice above the multitude and solemnly reproached them with their ungrateful doubtings. And he called the fountain which was in the place of Massa, then and there, the wells of *Meribah*—that is to say, "The waters of contention," because the Israelites had there striven against Moses, their leader, and tempted the Lord.

An Attack from the Bedouins.

The first detachments of the Jewish hosts having emerged from the narrow pass at *Rephidim*, which leads to the plateau of Sinai, they were about to pitch their tents, when suddenly the announcement was made that the line of the caravan in the rear was being attacked by hostile Bedouins. These native sons of the desert looked with angry jealousy upon this immense train of foreign invaders who were about to take possession of their most coveted oasis. Moses was not wholly unprepared for this new emergency. He forthwith ordered Hosea, one of his leaders, to take command of the men nearest the defile, and to form a line of defence for the camp. Hosea, who afterwards received the name of *Joshua* ("Help in Yahwe"), was of the tribe of Ephraim, who had in him the noble blood of Joseph. His valor and superior leadership are afterwards attested by his being chosen to succeed Moses as leader of the Israelites; and it is he who actually brought them into the promised land.

The first attacks of the Bedouins were apparently in the nature of skirmishes by which they attempted to break the line of the immense caravan. Toward nightfall the assault ceased, to be renewed in all probability the following day. But with the rising sun Hosea has mustered his men and is ready to give battle to the advancing bands of the desert. These wild marauders were a formidable race. Their great Sheik Amalek was a son of Eliphas (Gen. 36: 12 [16]), descendant of Esau, whose very blood was hostile to the children of Jacob because of the defrauded inheritance. It became a proverb in later times among the Jews that "Yahwe wages war against Amalek from generation to generation." The race-hatred of the descendants of Amalek survives to this day, and vents itself against the stranger of the West who comes to claim the right of sojourn in their lands. If we may trust the traditions of the past, the Bedouin of the days of Moses is the same as the Bedouin of to-day, in character, moral and intellectual disposition, manner of life, and social habits.

The freedom of the desert generates in him a spirit of independence, and intense love of liberty. The limitless expanse of the trackless sand-plains around, of the wide blue heavens above him, pro-

duce their effect upon his mind and heart. He understands the Eternal, for around him he sees forever only the creations of God, and in his dependence solely on these he becomes by nature contemplative. Silence is his habit, and allows the impressions of the universe to deepen. Thus there comes to him a constancy which makes of his ordinary belief a sacred conviction that nothing can alter. Unaccustomed to changes, not subject to the caprices of civilized life, his disposition takes on a perpetual equanimity, an outward stoicism which suggests no variations of moods. He is in all things like the changeless desert about him; and he values the freedom it gives him. No Christian ascete owns more of that liberty of spirit which discards all human respect. He turns his horse and his flocks in any direction he lists. He is as healthy as the animal of his desert, and all his faculties are well developed. His eye is keen and searching like the flash of light, and with it goes the swift intelligence of a mind not harassed by a multiplicity of aims or prejudiced by conventionalities. His judgment is clear, and uncorrupted by the temptation to invent falsehoods or pretensions; for of these he has no need. The true Bedouin is intrepid. He fears no man. From the day he mounts his bridleless steed he realizes that in future his safety lies in the power to urge and control that animal, in the strength of his own arm, in the courage with which he is ready to defend the hillside on which grazes his flock, or the well at which he and his wife and children slake their thirst.

Such are the sons of Amalek who lord it over all the creatures of the desert. Such is the native Arab of that same race to-day. He fears the God of nature. His tent, covered with the black skin of the goat, is irresistibly closed against the intruder; but it is ever open to the stranger seeking *hospitality* in the name of Allah; for the Bedouin realizes that all he has comes to him from the Creator whose works he sees forever about him. Hence he cannot forget Him, as does the citizen of the modern commonwealth hemmed in by the endless array of things which supply the artificial needs of our cultured lives. To the stranger that seeks his help the Bedouin is a friend; to the invader of his God-given rights he becomes a relentless and bitter enemy.

One cannot help admiring this strange creature of the desert;

mysterious in his silence; meditative like the solitude which inspires every motive of his life; bold, strong and fanatic with the ever-present consciousness that the world of Allah in which he dwells is all his own, and that so long as he trusts in Providence he can never be in want. Nor is he. The extreme abstemiousness of the Bedouin is a result of his training amid the surroundings in which he is forced to live.

Of this character were the hosts with whom Hosea was about to engage in battle because they questioned the right of the Israelitish caravans to enter the plain of Rephidim which God had given to the tribes of Amalek.

The Battle.

As the first rays of the sun appeared in the morning, the armies saw each other prepared for the fight. Hosea stood in advance of his host. Moses, Aaron and Hur had gone up to an elevation from which they could witness the engagement and possibly direct the movements of the Israelites. Hur, whom we have not yet met associated with Moses and Aaron, was of the tribe of Juda, and, according to the historian Josephus, he was the husband of Miriam, sister of Moses and Aaron. Moses was an old soldier, as we have seen, and he hoped to direct the battle from the elevated place which allowed him to overlook the movements of the two armies in the plain below. But it was not so much by the military strategy which he had learned in Egypt, that he found himself inspired to guide the Israelites, but by prayer. Whatever his knowledge of strategy or his prowess had taught him to dare in the past, no man had ever experienced the power of prayer as had Moses during the last few months. It was the one lesson that had come home to his heart amid innumerable trials throughout his contentions against the Pharaoh in Egypt; but much more since then in his dealings with a fickle multitude whom he was obliged to reconcile and humor, in order that by a gradual process of toleration he might train them to a spirit of reverential obedience to God's law. Hence he went up to the mountain that, witnessing the strife, he might in prayer

"move the Hand that moves the universe."

Help from the Rock.

And so it came about. Hour after hour the two armies fought in fierce battle. Again and again the Arab, superior by reason of his swift guerilla methods and the knowledge of the locality, seemed to gain the day. Then Moses stretched out his weary arms and besought the Lord to give victory to Israel; and thus he prayed with uplifted hands until the aged limbs refused to do the bidding of his soul. Strong in the faith and trust with which Yahwe had inspired their chief, Aaron and Hur now felt that the victory depended on the prayer of Moses whom God had appointed their mediator and high-priest. So they seated the sinking form of their pontiff upon a stone and uplifted his arms—beautiful symbol of the Sovereign Pontiff who to-day is seated on the rock upon the mountain at Rome, looking down upon the strife of the world of evil against the people of God, and sustained by the material aid of those who represent the faithful.

The prayer was heard, and the trust of Moses convinced,

> That no success attends on spears and swords
> Unblest, and that the battle is the Lord's,

was justified once more in the sight of Israel.

It was a long struggle. But when the sun sank that day, the plain and by-ways round about Rephidim were filled with the corpses of the fierce sons of the desert, and the remnant of the Amalekites had fled into the mountains under cover of the darkness. The children of Israel were at rest, and they would now take possession of the beautiful broad swarth surrounded by lofty mountains where they might lodge safely for a time and repair their losses and arrange for the further journey.

That night Moses had a dream in which the Lord commanded him to write a record of the victory over the Amalekites, and Yahwe comforted him with the assurance of His future protection against the hostile hordes of the desert.

On the morrow the aged chief called together the Israelites, and they built an altar to the Lord, and offered holocaust in thanksgiving, because Yahwe had been "the exaltation of Israel."

An Unexpected Family Reunion.

Not long after this a messenger comes to Moses and informs him of the approach of a friendly caravan. It was Zipporah—"the little bird," as the name signifies in the Semitic tongue—who came with her two little boys to seek her husband. Her children sat with her under the canopy on the tawny camel—*Gershom*, the elder, and *Eliezer*, whose sons were one day to keep guard over the sacred gifts in the housee of David. It will be remembered that it was in this very region that Moses, some years before, had tended the flocks of Jethro; not far from here, too, he had parted with his wife, Jethro's daughter, and the two little ones, since he had received warning from Yahwe that the work of Israel's liberation was to be accomplished by a man free from the ties of family obligation.

The severe etiquette of the East, even among the desert tribes, does not allow a woman to travel unescorted by her kinsfolk. Zipporah had a brother (as appears from a passage in the Book of Numbers 10: 29), who at this time was absent with his Kenite Bedouins. He was a sheik, like his father, in Midian.[6] It was Jethro, then, her aged father, who had sent word by the runner ("postman," Job 9: 25) to Moses, saying, "I, thy father-in-law, Jethro, am come unto thee, and thy wife and her two sons with her" (Exod. 18: 6); for Jethro had heard of the great caravan that had gone out from Egypt, and he knew that it was the work of his kinsman, Moses.

And now there depicts itself a scene in the desert which, as outlined in the simple words of the Sacred Writer, is a perfect counterpart of the customs in the Arabia of to-day. Moses, hearing the name of his wife and children, sets out to meet the caravan. We can, perhaps, realize the joy of his heart when we recall to mind the isolation in which he found himself at that moment in the very midst of an applauding multitude. Had not that very multitude threatened to stone him to death but a few days ago, when they felt in want of food! How often had they murmured against him since the morning on which, in hopeful gratitude to God after many a disap-

[6] Kenites were probably a tribe of the Midianite race.

pointment, he had led them out of the land of bondage! And Aaron, his brother, and Miriam, his sister—could he not rely upon their sympathy and counsel? Alas! no. We shall see how quickly even brother and sister turn from him when the time of trial calls for individual courage on their part. We shall see Aaron himself afraid of the anger of the people, and, less confiding in God than Moses, shamefully abandon the responsibility of his leadership during his brother's brief absence on the mountain. And Miriam, poor fickle heart, we find her afterwards too betraying her brother through very jealousy of his affection.

Could he then rely on those who seemed so near to him? No; and his superior instincts and knowledge of the human heart made him well aware of it.

But Zipporah!—he felt differently toward her. He had sent her away, back to her father's house, near that very spot where they were now to meet, because his high mission demanded that he should be wholly free from family care and ties. It was God's declared will, and although Moses could not make her fully comprehend the necessity of such a sacrifice, we know that he finally obtained her consent to it. We must not forget that there is in the providential ordinances of God something in a true wife's affection that renders her attachment superior to all other earthly relations in life, even to those of parent and child. God Himself indicates this fact when in blessing the first marriage in Paradise (Gen. 2: 24), He bids a husband leave father and mother (Matt. 19: 5; Eph. 5: 31), and cling to the wife of his choice.

In the case of Zipporah the pledge of her love for Moses was to be found in his two children. These he loved. Somehow the heart of Moses is revealed to us in the very names he gave to them at their birth; for *Gershom* means "pilgrim," "wanderer in a strange land." It was to remind not only the father but in future days the child also that their race was destined for a better home, a home in the promised land of Canaan, and beyond, in the happy realms of the restored Eden. And his little one, the Benjamin, his white-haired boy—him he had called *Eliezer*, which signifies "the Lord (*Eli-Elohim*) my helper." That name was to remind the father, as often as it sounded in his ear or touched the chords of his affectionate memory, that Yahwe was his keeper. Yahwe

who had delivered the father from the hands of the Pharaoh and from death, at the time of his flight. That child would be a light to him now, amid the gloom around, for he might look into the liquid depths of those innocent eyes and see there the image of the azure heavens above, telling him that beyond the darksome clouds of discontent that surrounded him, there was a world of light revealing the power and goodness of Yahwe on His throne, for whom the world was but a footstool.

So the heart of Moses bounded up in gladness as he went forth with servants to meet his father-in-law, who came in advance of the tent-camels bearing Zipporah and her retinue.

"And Moses," says the sacred writer with exquisite simplicity, "and Moses went out to meet his father-in-law, and did obedience, and kissed him; and they asked each other of their welfare; and they came into the tent." (Exod. 18: 7.)

The salutations of the East are very varied according to the condition of those who meet. The *shalom* (salaam) or kiss of peace is customary among friends and kindred. It is preceded by low bows at some distance, then a double embrace, followed by a number of mutual questions and replies as to the welfare of each of the parties. These salutations have the air of a sacred ceremony, and are, like the law of hospitality, deemed of the greatest importance. The stranger finds it difficult to master all the details of the code of civility with which the ordinary Oriental is thoroughly familiar. The contempt of the Arab for a foreigner in the East arises as much from the latter's apparent disregard of forms of courtesy, as from his religious difference (or indifference). The Eastern philosopher rightly considers that *ceremony is the smoke of reverence*, and reverence preserves the flame of love in the small, and the light of peace in the larger circles of society.

It is not stated in the Book of Exodus how Moses met Zipporah and her little ones; and this, too, is in keeping with the Eastern fashion of to-day, according to which a woman is never or most rarely mentioned among men; just as she is not saluted by men in public. In the modern Arab this may be part of his philosophy which considers woman a subordinate creation, but it is also part of his reverence, which considers her, if I may use the word, intangible. It does not follow that because an Arab or

a Druse believes a woman devoid of those faculties which constitute the pride of his manhood, that he is less attached to her. His reverence for her is often that which we have for a child whose very weakness claims the protection of manly strength. If he likes her, he loves her; if she cannot conciliate his affection, he sends her away. Such is the Bedouin.

We can picture to ourselves Zipporah as the train of camels approaches the place where the tents of meeting have been pitched. At a touch of the driver's wand on the neck of the camel, that patient carrier of man's burdens bends his knees, and gently, with a slow swaying of his huge body, lodges on the ground. Zipporah lightly descends from her canopied seat on the animal's back; the children are lifted from the side saddles which carried them securely as in a cradle; and together they enter the tent prepared for them. Here Moses meets them. He reverently kisses the wide sleeve of his wife's garment, affectionately caresses his little ones, and with a blessing leads them to their mother, who is now seated and awaiting the joyful tones of his well-remembered voice.

But of this meeting we know only what custom and tradition have preserved, outside the Sacred Text. Much more explicit is the writer of Exodus regarding the intercourse of Moses with his father-in-law, Jethro. They went into the tent of Moses together. "And Moses told his father-in-law all that Yahwe had done unto Pharaoh and to the Egyptians for Israel's sake, all the mishaps that had come upon them by the way, and how Yahwe delivered them. And Jethro rejoiced and blessed Yahwe, for 'now,' he said, 'I know that Yahwe is greater than all gods.'"

The passage of Exodus throws light upon the religious belief of Jethro, who, though originally a Hebrew, appears to have been influenced by the polytheistic beliefs around him. Now, however, he professes his faith in Yahwe; and in order to seal that profession by a solemn act he proposes to celebrate a great sacrifice: "And Jethro, Moses' father-in-law, took a burnt offering and sacrifices for God; and Aaron came, and all the elders of Israel, to eat bread with the father-in-law of Moses before God." *To eat bread with his friends before God* beautifully expresses the relations that the Oriental law of hospitality bears to the religious faith which furnishes its principal motive.

BROTHER AND SISTER.

Chapter V.—The Devil's Pool.

NEEDLESS to say, it was with the greatest care that I was prepared to receive the Sacrament of the most Holy Eucharist. Keenly alive to the importance of this great act, Marguerite left nothing undone which could serve to dispose my soul for the visit of our Lord, especially during the months just previous to the event, when her efforts were redoubled. I approached the Holy Table for the first time in 1852, on the Feast of Pentecost, which fell that year on the third of June, an ever memorable date for me. This signal favor made the more profound impression upon me, because, a few hours before, I had narrowly escaped death. I shall briefly narrate this incident.

My sister and I had been at Saint-Laurent for three days, making the preparatory retreat. On the evening of the second of June, after hearing the afternoon instruction and going to confession, I returned to Mesnil with Marguerite, who had remained in the church waiting for me. We were both very much affected and very happy—so happy that we found no words in which to express our feelings, and we walked half the way in silence. I shall never forget the sense of profound and soothing peace which pervaded my mind and heart that evening. Marguerite did not disturb my recollection. She herself seemed to experience great interior joy. We were very far from foreseeing the scene of excitement in which we were to be the actors an hour later.

As we drew near Mesnil, I said in a low tone to my sister: "Guitte, is it true what the Father said this morning that there are children who offend the good Lord again after their first Holy Communion?"

Marguerite smiled. "It is true, Paul, dear," she said; "but it is because they do not pray as they should. If you are faithful to your prayers you will never displease Him again, at least not in a grave matter."

"Guitte," I said again, "suppose I should ask our Lord to let me die now, sooner than risk losing my soul by living any longer?"

"Ask Him, if you wish," she replied. "Our good Jesus will surely be pleased with that prayer."

I ran at once toward a calvary set up by the roadside, and kneeling before the sign of our Redemption, I asked God not to let me live if I were going to make use of my life only to lose my soul.

We continued on our way, talking together of the Heavenly Guest who was so soon to take up His abode in my heart.

I would willingly have remained with Marguerite the rest of the day, talking about God. When we reached home (it was then about five o'clock), I asked her to stay with me until supper time.

"I would like to very much, dear boy," she said. "To-day especially. Nothing would please me better than to be with you; but I must go and see poor Madame Herteaux of La Sorinière, who is still very sick. I do not want to leave you to-morrow, so I must go there now."

Cillette passed the window just then, and Marguerite called to her: "Go and tell your brother to saddle Fanfan and bring him round to me at once."

"What!" I said, somewhat surprised, "are you going on horseback this time?"

"Yes," she answered. "La Sorinière is five miles away, and I am a little tired with all the walking I have done already, and, besides, I want to get back soon."

"Well, said I, "I will go as far as the Gemme with you and then come home and wait. Don't be long, for I have so many things to tell you about."

"Fanfan has swift feet," she answered. "He has had nothing to do for five or six days and he will fly like a swallow. In fifty minutes at the latest I shall be back."

We started about half-past five o'clock down the long avenue of chestnut trees which extended as far as the meadows bordering the Gemme. I think I have already said that this river was only about fifteen hundred yards from Mesnil. Fanfan, saddled and bridled, followed us, playing in the deep grass. Unmoved by his plaintive whining we had left Tom tied in his corner, which was an unusual proceeding, but I wanted to avoid any occasion of distraction which might result from romping too boisterously with my old friend.

Arrived at the end of the avenue, we noticed that some one had left open the gate which separated the property from the commons. "Let's shut the gate," said Marguerite, "or else the cows and sheep will be running all over the place."

It was an oak affair, about six feet high, which was fastened by means of a padlock. When we had closed it, I said, laughing: "Now you will have to dismount, on your way back, and open it again; unless you make Fanfan take the leap."

"No indeed!" said she. "I have no desire to practise high-jumping."

A few minutes later we had crossed the meadows and reached the river-banks, which in this place was quite steep and rocky. We stood just above a sudden decided deepening in the bed of the stream, a sort of open hole about thirty feet down, called by the country-folk the "Devil's Pool." The Gemme, up to that point very rapid, flows more quietly opposite Mesnil, for the course of the river here changes abruptly from north to west, and the bank itself opposes an obstacle to the swiftness of the current. It is the most dangerous place along the river, for the current, suddenly broken, here produces a violent whirlpool. Many accidents have taken place here. Two children about my age had been drowned a few days before.

"Go back to the house now," Marguerite said to me; "don't stay here by yourself; you know how afraid I am of this place."

"Don't worry about me," I answered. "I am not going to drown myself to-day. I just want to get you a little bunch of those lovely white flowers. They are just meant for you. I can easily reach them."

As I spoke, I ran to the very edge of the bank, and began to pick the flowers which had excited my desire. My feet rested for an instant on the top of the rock which overhung the Devil's Pool.

"Come back, Paul," called Marguerite. "Don't stand there! Do be careful!"

"Be easy," I replied gaily. "What are you afraid of? It's safe. See here!"

Hardly had I uttered the words when the crest of the rock, undermined by the weather, gave way beneath my feet with a

terrible crash. In vain did I try to catch myself by laying hold of the branches of a bush which I passed in my flight; they broke with my weight, and I was precipitated from the top of the bank into the deep water. I heard Marguerite's heart-rending cry, and then I felt myself sinking to the bottom. A thousand thoughts rushed through my brain in those few seconds. "Here I am in the Devil's Pool. No chance of getting out. So I am to die after all before my First Communion! It's just as well. I am in a state of grace, I hope. Perhaps my prayer that I said a while ago has been heard. Ah! If Tom were only here! Poor Marguerite! This will kill her! What will the other children say to-morrow when they hear I am drowned?"

Meanwhile I struggled convulsively; my eyes and nostrils filled with water; I seemed to hear a deafening noise, and felt that I was choking. I still had time to ask God to forgive my sins, and then I lost consciousness.

When Marguerite, who was only a few steps from the water's edge, saw me fall, she rushed forward with the intention of jumping in after me. She did not know how to swim, and her only hope was for some providential intervention. "Holy Mother, help us!" she prayed.

Just as she was about to throw herself into the pool, the idea darted through her brain: "Oh, if I only had Tom here!" Then a ray of hope appeared. She had Fanfan. He was remarkably light, and fleet as a race horse. She might have time to go and fetch the Newfoundland. Turning back, she whistled to Fanfan who was but a few yards away and came trotting up at her call. Swift as thought she had mounted and set off at top speed for Mesnil. The spirited animal tore on at a wild pace as if he knew his master's life depended on the swiftness of his limbs. Clinging to his mane to keep her seat, Marguerite's hope began to rise as she realized the marvellous rapidity with which she was being borne along. "Perhaps I shall be in time!" she said to herself. But soon a terrible thought struck her: "I closed the gate! Fanfan will never be able to leap it, and I shall have to dismount and lose at least a minute! O, God, have mercy on us! Help me to get over the gate! Dear God, I must! My brother's life depends on it!"

And now only a few yards and they would reach the barrier. "Up! Fanfan! Good horse! Up, up, jump!"

Marguerite's heart almost stops beating from suspense, and she shuts her eyes so as not to see . . . Ah! Victory! A superb leap bears them to the other side of the gate. Bravo, Fanfan, bravo! The faithful creature resumes his furious course and flies like lightning up the avenue of chestnut trees. Like a whirlwind he sweeps by the house and stops short before Tom's corner as if he knew the intentions of his mistress. To leap down, untie the dog, shout to the amazed Cillette to tell everybody to hurry to the Devil's Pool that I had just fallen in, was but the work of an instant. Fanfan had not budged an inch, but stood motionless at his post like a soldier on guard. Hardly had my sister regained the saddle when he started back again at the same fiendish pace as before. Marguerite no longer feared the gate. In a flash her horse had taken it as easily as a chamois, and stopped of his own accord at the place whence I had fallen. Tom got there almost as soon.

"In the water, Tom! Go, good dog!" cried Marguerite, pointing to the spot where I had fallen. "There, there! Go, get your master, Tom! Fetch him out! Do you hear, fetch him!" Her voice was at the same time commanding and entreating.

The animal, with the wonderful instinct of his race, understood that some one was to be saved, and plunged into the water. For thirty mortal seconds Marguerite remained on her knees upon the bank, her eyes fixed upon the surface of the pool, which gradually regained the smoothness disturbed by Tom's leap. At last the dog reappeared. Oh heavens! He had found nothing. "My Mother Mary," prayed the poor child, "it was you who made me his mother. Do not let him die before his First Communion! I promise if you will bring him back, to go with him on foot to your shrine at Nantes, and always to fast on Saturday in your honor."

Meantime the dog, after getting his breath, dived again under the water. Marguerite upon the rock, her hand at her heart, which was beating as if about to burst, felt her strength leaving her. "I thought," she said to me later, "that I would die of

anguish; but I still had the energy to ask our Lord to leave you at the bottom of the pool, if it were better for your soul's salvation."

Suddenly, a hundred feet away from the place where I had fallen in, Tom made his appearance once more, and, to Marguerite's unspeakable joy, she saw him swimming slowly toward the shore, holding me above the water by my clothes which he had seized firmly in his teeth. The sight brought back her strength and presence of mind. She rushed to the spot toward which the Newfoundland was making, and took me in her arms, pale, disfigured, and apparently lifeless. I had been ten minutes in the Devil's Pool.

At this point my aunt, old Rose, whose heart had lent strength to her limbs, Cillette, Lexis, and all the people on the place ran up terrified, shouting, groaning, weeping and sobbing. Marguerite, who had recovered her composure and energy, at once began to use the most sensible means of restoring me. I was out of the water, but it remained to be seen whether I was still alive. The most vigorous rubbing had no effect. The point was to make me draw my breath, but my teeth were so tightly set that one was broken in the effort to force open my mouth. Once this was accomplished, it was possible to breathe a little air in, and to move the tongue, drawing it out at regular intervals, and all this gradually revived me by reëstablishing the action of the lungs.

I was saved. Still weak and almost insensible, I was carried on a mattress back to Mesnil, where Marguerite, after administering a cordial, put me to bed. I soon fell into a deep sleep. About nine in the evening I awoke, and was able to get up and take something to eat. The next morning, as fresh and well as if nothing had happended, without even feeling fatigued, I went to Saint-Laurent, accompanied by the whole household, and made my First Communion with undisturbed recollection. I have always attributed this recovery, so rapid and so opportune, to Marguerite's prayers. My gratitude to our Lord was lively and sincere. "I owe my life to you twice over, O my God," I prayed on receiving Him in my heart, "but I know well it is only for eternity you have saved me, since I asked for life only on that condition."

The story of my escape was already known to everybody in Saint-Laurent and in the country round about. Our good pastor alluded to it in the little address which he made us just before Holy Communion, and impressed upon us the importance of always being in a state pleasing to God. After Mass every one gathered around. The children, and their elders, too, all wanted to see me and shake my hand. Marguerite had to give over and over again, a hundred times at least, her account of the adventure, and they were never tired of singing her praises, while Fanfan's speed and the wonderful instinct of Tom came in for their share of admiration. In short, we were all four the heroes of the hour.

My aunt had invited Abbé Aubry and his assistants, as well as the notary and Doctor Durand, to dine at Mesnil. The repast was a joyful one, as may well be imagined. Old Rose surpassed herself. I think she must have made up her mind to make me guilty of the sin of gluttony on the very day of my First Communion. Marguerite gaily diverted to her horse and dog all the compliments showered upon her, so, at dessert, we unanimously awarded a gold medal of the first class to the brave Newfoundland and a bronze medal to the little horse to whose swift feet I owed my life.

"Goodness," said good Cillette, "who ever saw smarter beasts than those two? All they need is to talk. If it wasn't for them, Master Paul would have drowned; that's sure—and our mistress too. No one can deny it; for she would never have the heart to leave the poor little fellow to flounder in the water. She would have been in it this very minute herself, that's sure, if she hadn't had those two animals with her."

Marguerite and I were resolved to fulfil as soon as possible the promise she made in the hour of danger, so we planned our pilgrimage for the Monday after Trinity Sunday. The journey would take three days. We were to spend the first night at Varades, the second at Oudon, reaching Nantes the evening of the third day, which was the vigil of Corpus Christi. Aunt Dumoulin, kind soul that she was, arranged to be present with all her people on Thursday, at the Mass of the pilgrimage. For this purpose she hired a big, two-horse brake large enough to hold all the household at Mensil, and appointed Wednesday for the day of

departure. Our pastor also declared his intention of joining the pious expedition, and celebrating Mass at the altar of Our Lady of Prompt Succor at Nantes. The assistants, to their regret, were obliged to remain behind to attend to the affairs of the parish.

We set out on the day appointed with eager step and joyful hearts, crossing the Loire at Saint-Florent in order to follow the right bank to Nantes. The journey was delightful and far too short to satisfy me. I was carried away at the prospect of sleeping at an inn like a real tourist. Marguerite was less enthusiastic, but she sympathized with my innocent enjoyment. We reached the Hotel de Bretagne at Nantes on Wednesday evening, and there we found Abbé Aubry and my aunt and her party, who had arrived a few hours before. The next morning, at an early hour, we made our way to the Church of Sainte-Croix, where Abbé Aubry celebrated the Mass of thanksgiving. I was allowed to receive Holy Communion, in view of the extraordinary occasion, though but ten days had passed since my First Communion. Rose, Cillette and Lexis did likewise. Even my aunt, forgetting her Jansenistic notions, approached the Holy Table in thanksgiving to our Lord for having preserved us. From that day she made it a rule to receive the Holy Eucharist once a month. The good Lord prepared her in this way for her death, which was not far off.

After Mass we returned to the hotel, where an excellent breakfast awaited us. About ten o'clock we got into the wagon, and bidding farewell to Nantes, started back for Mesnil. At Oudon we rested, and by nightfall we were at home again.

The eventful second of June remained fixed in my memory, and it was my safeguard in the evil days.

JEAN CHARRUAU, S.J.

Student's Library Table.

CURRENT SCIENCE.

The Passing of Spencer.—Mr. Herbert Spencer's recent death caused only a ripple of interest, the fact of the matter being that Mr. Spencer had outlived the influence of his own philosophy and could not conceal the fact that he died a very disappointed man. He set out some fifty years ago to make a new system of philosophy on the basis of evolution. He did not a little to spread evolutionary ideas among scientific men, and thus to popularize among the intellectual classes aspects of science that would not have become so generalized but for his brilliant presentation of them, his wonderfully clear expression, and his admirable logic, if only his original principles were admitted. It is rather interesting to reflect now that while his doctrines seriously perturbed not a few thinking Christians, they are to-day absolutely a thing of the past.

Even Mr. Spencer's favorite expressions, that became almost shibboleths in the development and popularization of evolutionary literature, are no longer listened to with patience by real scientists. The expression, for instance, "the survival of the fittest," does not represent in any sense a new truth, but a very obvious fact. It is a platitude to say that those most fit for life maintain themselves best against whatever opposing conditions there may be in existence. It adds nothing, however, to biological knowledge to formulate this fact. As a matter of universal acceptance the fittest do survive, because they have by inheritance certain supreme qualities of vitality which promote their survival. This is true even in the very highly organized beings, and physicians are agreed that the most important factor in securing longevity is a family heredity that shows many long-lived persons in the ancestors. It is the innate qualities, and not anything added by the environment, or even subtracted by the environment, except as far as accidental causes may hamper the essentials of vitality, that really bring about survival.

In biology generally Herbert Spencer's deductions illustrate very well the expression of an American biologist who said not long since, "Nature never acts according to the anticipations of the closet philosopher." There were many who thought that Spencer occupied a prominent place in modern biology. It was not the biologists, however, who thought this. And this was true in other sciences besides biology. One distinguished scientist, indeed, summed up his criticism of Herbert Spencer twenty years ago by asserting that scientists usually considered Mr. Spencer to be an authority in all other branches, but not in their own. The expression is a concise formula for the man and his career. He attempted to know all science in order to create a new philosophy of science. He secured only a superficial knowledge of the sciences, and as a consequence his philosophy does not touch the essentials of scientific thinking in most cases, and formulated only the impression of a passing epoch in scientific thought.

Another favorite expression of Mr. Spencer's which is often quoted by popular lecturers, because the length of the words is apt to arouse a smile, is "Ontogony recapitulates phylogeny"—that is, the history of each individual living being is a compendium of the history of the race to which it belongs, as much as to say that each living thing goes through the series of developments through which the race has passed in reaching its present state of evolution. As is well known, all living things begin as single cells. According to evolution, the most complex beings are supposed to have arisen originally from single-cell beings, and the single cell that represents the animal embryo is supposed to correspond, according to Mr. Spencer's principle, with the single-cell animal beings that we now know. As was pointed out by an editorial writer in the *Journal of the American Medical Association* recently, the advance in biology has made it very clear that these single embryonic cells from which one of the higher animals is to develop, is a very different particle of matter, even in its physical constitution and chemical composition, from the persistent single-cell being, as, for example, the amœba. The basic principle, then, that was supposed to underlie this evolutionary dogma is at fault. Professor Hertwig, of Berlin, the greatest of living embryologists, took considerable pains some ten years ago to establish the falsity

of any notion of identity of value that might be considered to flow from this principle.

With regard to life Mr. Spencer himself changed his views considerably in recent years. While in his *Principles of Psychology*, written nearly fifty years ago, when he was about thirty-five, he said: "The chasm between the inorganic and the organic is being filled up; the microscope has traced down organisms to simpler and simpler forms, until, in the protogenes of Professor Haeckel, there has been reached a type distinguishable from a fragment of albumen only by its finely granulated character,"—within the last five years he completely altered this statement. In a letter published in *Nature*,[1] Mr. Spencer said: "In my revised *Principles of Biology*, I have contended that the theory of a vital principle fails, and that a physico-chemical theory of life also fails; the corollary being that in its ultimate nature life is incomprehensible."

In this complete change of opinion Spencer only reflected the corresponding modification of view which had become prevalent in recent biology. The present feeling with regard to life and its significance is very different from what it was a quarter of a century and more back. Then Tyndall was insisting that he saw in matter "the promise and potency of all things." Haeckel, who was teaching a pure materialism, was at the height of his fame as a scientist, and had not yet begun to be considered the least progressive of German scientific thinkers. It is very different now, when Lord Kelvin insists that science must positively affirm creative power, "since biology makes everyone feel the miracle of life in himself and every action of the human free will is a miracle to physical and chemical and mathematical science." Spencer came to the recognition of the mystery of life, and in so doing showed his proper realization of the failure of physics and chemistry to explain what we know of vital force. A materialistic evolutionary system of thought has no advocates among the present scientists, and with its passing Mr. Spencer's philosophy loses its significance.

Agnosticism and Death.—Of course it is not to be expected that a genuine agnostic who takes himself seriously should have

[1] London, October 20, 1898.

any encouraging thoughts to utter with regard to death. It is not surprising then to find that the last message by Mr. Herbert Spencer's disciple, Mr. Leonard Courtney, as the body of his master waited at the door of the crematory, is expressive of nothing more than of stoical resignation and blind hope. He said:

"The brain so full and so powerful has ceased to act. There is no longer any manifestation of consciousness. Can consciousness survive after the organ on which it depended has ceased to be? Is the personality that dwelt in this poor frame to be admitted as in itself indestructible? Or must we acquiesce in its reabsorption in the infinite, the ever-abiding, the ineffable energy of which it was a passing spark? If indestructible in the future, must it not have been as incapable of coming into existence as it is incapable of ceasing to be? Our master knew not. He could not tell. The last enigma defies our question. The dimensions of the unknown may be reduced through successive ages, but compared with our slender discoveries, estimated at the best, the vastness that remains must ever overawe us. Some fringes of the unknowable may yet prove to be capable of being known, but the great central secret lies beyond our apprehension. Yet two thoughts remain. If the night cometh in which no man can work, we may work while it is day. If we can work, it is somehow within our power to work for what is noble, for what is inspiring, for what is broadening, deepening, and strengthening the life of man. We may devote our lives to the service of supreme goodness. Looking back on the years of Spencer, we may say that he thus worked, he thus dedicated himself as truly and as bravely as any man enjoying the solace of a more definite creed."

The only consolation then at the end of it all is that Spencer did his work as well as if he had the faith which has made life so satisfactory to so many of mankind, without the cold uncertainty and indefinite prospects of agnosticism. At the best they can only hope to do their work as well and without any of the personal satisfaction that comes to the believer. There is not much temptation to become one of them under such circumstances.

Disease and War.—It has been well known for many years, even centuries, that the disease cost of war was always more than the actual loss in battle. This was true in the old mediæval times when epidemics carried off the soldiers crowded into insanitary

camps, and especially true when the soldiery scattered epidemics after the war was over. Even in very modern times, however, the axiom that disease carries off more men then bullets do has always been true. Our Civil War was a striking example, notwithstanding the lessons afforded by it and the magnificent records kept by the Surgeon-General's Department, which are considered in Europe the most helpful reports of this kind ever made. During the Franco-Prussian War disease continued to hold its sway as the important factor in mortality.

We are still familiar with the medical aspect of our little war with Spain at the end of last century, when sanitary science and medicine had presumably made so many advances as to render the preservation of large bodies of men from epidemic diseases at least a matter of definite precautions. The failure of our medical department in this is considered to have been inevitable, and it is only to be hoped that the experience gained will prove of value. As a matter of fact, however, with the end of the war, we were by no means at the end of its sanitary dangers. For several years after the conclusion of hostilities an epidemic of small-pox raged throughout this country, which is not yet entirely over, and which, in the opinion of all medical authorities, was due to the scattering of foci of the disease by the returning soldiers who in Porto Rico and Cuba had been exposed to infection by the germs of small-pox. The same thing seems to be true with regard to malaria; and there have been many more cases of malaria reported each spring since the Cuban and Porto Rican campaigns than for several years before. The tendency of malaria to relapse in the springtime is well known, and these relapses seem to have afforded the opportunity for the infection of mosquitoes that have further spread the disease.

This is not all, however. In the first issue of the *Medical News* (of New York) for the present year, attention was called editorially to the number of epidemics of typhoid fever which have occurred in various parts of this country during the last three years. Some of these have developed in university towns and have carried off many promising young people besides inflicting great suffering and anxiety upon the parents of many others. At the present time there are more scattered foci of typhoid fever in the country

than there have been at any period for many years. This state of affairs the editor attributes to the fact that many of our soldiers during their campaigns in the Philippines have been exposed to infection with typhoid fever and have brought back its germs. It is now well known, that the bacilli of typhoid fever may remain in the excreta of patients who have suffered from typhoid fever even for several months, perhaps longer, after convalescence from the disease has been completely established. In the tropical climates typhoid fever sometimes runs an anomalous course and may be of brief duration. In these cases its existence is sometimes unsuspected because of the febrile disturbances to which the unacclimatized are so liable in tropical countries.

It is not clear then how much the war is yet to cost. Sanitary science has not succeeded in reducing its dangers much. The whole situation is only another argument for the necessity for peace and the cultivation of methods of arbitration rather than appeals to arms in international quarrels. Nature has her revenge often unsuspected, and in this the conqueror is apt to suffer quite as much if not more than the conquered.

The Spinthariscope.—A new physical instrument which is, however, scarcely more than a pretty, though an extremely interesting toy, has recently been put upon the market as the result of a suggestion of Sir William Crooke, the distinguished British scientist, to whom we owe the suggestive announcement of the Crooke's tube and most of our ideas with regard to the proposed fourth or radiant state of matter. The spinthariscope consists of a set of lenses at the focus of which, in a light-tight case, there is a minute fragment of radium, somewhat less than one-twentieth of a milligram in weight, that is, something less than 1–1000th of a grain. This tiny bit of metal is fastened to a wire lying on a background on which is spread sulphide of zinc.

If this instrument be applied to the eye in a darkened room after the eye has become accustomed to the darkness so that acuity of vision for light is at its highest, a very interesting set of phenomena are observed. A shower of minute sparks are seen to fly off from a central shining body. These sparks are crowded together near the centre of the field of vision, that is, in close proximity to the particle of radium; while there are less of them,

the farther out from the centre where observations are made. As long as the radium is looked at, these brilliant corruscations continue, as though there were some inexhaustible piece of fireworks at the focus of the instrument. The instrument is called a spinthariscope from the Greek words for *spark* and *to see*, and one glance is sufficient to show how applicable is the name. The scintillations continue unabated in spite of loss of substance, and may be seen at any time for weeks, or months, with apparently no lessening of the exhaustless store of energy that is thus expending itself, though the original source of the energy is the tiniest particle of metal that looks not unlike a grain of salt to the naked eye and weighs less than one-thousandth of a grain.

M. Curie, the co-discoverer, with Madame Curie, of radium and its properties, has a curious expression that he uses to describe the beautiful effects seen by means of the new toy. It looks, of course, like thousands of shooting stars whose origin might well be some collision of huge bodies in space. M. Curie says then, "It is as if we were allowed to assist at the birth of a universe—*or at the death of a molecule.*" As a matter of fact, that is all that is seen. The minute piece of radium is gradually giving off its atomic constituents, and will eventually disappear, though no instrument made can measure the loss of weight in any ordinary given time. One might expect rapid exhaustion because of the wonderful display produced by the corruscations of the metal, which remind one vividly of the sparks given off from heated iron in a blacksmith's shop, yet there is no sensible depreciation in the weight or size of radium even after long periods.

Rotation of Crops and Enrichment of Soil.—One of the most interesting discoveries of recent times is the fact that it is biology and not chemistry that has to do with the fertilization and the enrichment of soil. It is not air and sunlight and moisture that cause the accumulation in fallow land of the nitrogen of the air which is so important for the growth of all vegetable material. Even the carbon products are obtained only through the agency of minute living organisms that have the power of building up low-grade chemicals into the complex compounds which are absolutely necessary for the nutrition of more highly organized life. It has been found, for instance, that the leguminous vege-

tables, among which are included such important food products as peas, and beans, and lentils, and the like, owe their growth to certain nodular masses which appear on the roots of these vegetables. These nodes, or root tubercles, as they are called, consist of masses of micro-organisms which are capable of taking certain free nitrogen products and of transforming them into nitrogen compounds capable of absorption by the plants.

One of the most interesting examples of how much the growth of such plants may prove of service to fields exhausted by a constant succession of crops of wheat or corn, is to be found in the so-called alfalfa. This is a leguminous plant that has recently come to occupy a very important place in our Western farm lands. It is said now to be the most important factor in the upbuilding of the extensive dairying district of our Middle West. Expert Western dairymen say that in the future the cows fed on alfalfa will produce the standard butter of the country. The quality of butter that is obtained is better than that from any other kind of feeding.

The plant has come to have its great importance within the last ten years. Over and over again it has been found that it would grow luxuriantly and produce very well-paying crops on land that was worn out by having been planted to corn year after year for a long time. This has proved that the rotation of crops can be made actually to benefit a field. After alfalfa has been grown for several years there may be a return to corn and wheat and the land will be found to have become suitable for further crops of the cereal. From a farm of twenty acres a thousand bushels of alfalfa seed have been sold for a thousand dollars and the hay for $350. In itself then the crop is eminently a paying one.

The reason for the wonderful properties of the alfalfa is, of course, first, that being leguminous it produces and encourages the growth of large numbers of the bacteria that are especially helpful in the matter of soil enrichment. Besides this, however, the roots of the alfalfa do not grow merely near the surface of the soil, but reach down deeply. An alfalfa plant a year old will easily have roots three feet long. The roots of three-year-old alfalfa may be over eight feet long. An eight-year-old plant in

stiff hard pan subsoil has been followed for a depth of ten feet before the end of the tap root was found. Instances are on record where the roots have been found from thirty to sixty feet away from the plant. A mining tunnel in Nevada was over 120 feet below an alfalfa field, yet the roots of the plants were found in the roof. It is easy to understand the expression then that the alfalfa sends its roots to where there is no drought. When the large boring roots decay, they leave their own fertilizing ingredients and openings for air and water to penetrate. No wonder alfalfa is called "the Western mortgage-lifter." Its cultivation and development is due not a little to the encouragement and data given by the United States Experiment stations.

Studies and Conferences.

SACRED MUSIC.

Pius X. Pope.

"MOTU PROPRIO."

Among the cares of the pastoral office, not only of this Supreme Chair, which we, though unworthy, occupy through the inscrutable disposition of Providence, but of every local church, a leading one is without question that of maintaining and promoting the decorum of the House of God in which the august mysteries of religion are celebrated, and where the Christian people assemble to receive the grace of the Sacraments, to assist at the Holy Sacrifice of the altar, to adore the most august Sacrament of the Lord's Body, and to unite in the common prayer of the Church in the public and solemn liturgical services. Nothing should have place, therefore, in the temple calculated to disturb or even merely to diminish the piety and devotion of the faithful; nothing that may give reasonable cause for indignation or scandal; nothing, above all, which directly offends the decorum and the sanctity of the sacred functions and is thus unworthy of the house of prayer and of the Majesty of God. We do not touch separately on the abuses in this matter which may arise. To-day our attention is directed to one of the most common of them, one of the most difficult to eradicate, one whose existence is sometimes to be deplored in places where everything else is deserving of the highest praise—the beauty and sumptuousness of the temple, the splendor and the accurate performance of the ceremonies, the attendance of the clergy, the gravity and piety of the officiating ministers. Such is the abuse affecting sacred chant and music. And indeed, whether it is owing to the very nature of this art, fluctuating and variable as it is in itself, or to the succeeding changes in tastes and habits with the course of time, or to the fatal influence exercised on sacred art by profane and theatrical art, or to the pleasure that music directly produces, and that is not always easily contained within the right limits, or finally to the

many prejudices on the matter, so lightly introduced and so tenaciously maintained even among responsible and pious persons, the fact remains that there is a tendency to deviate from the right rule, prescribed by the end for which art is admitted to the service of the public worship and which is set forth very clearly in the ecclesiastical canons, in the ordinances of the General and Provincial Councils, in the prescriptions which have at various times emanated from the Sacred Roman Congregations, and from our predecessors the Sovereign Pontiffs.

It is gratifying to us to be able to acknowledge with real satisfaction the great good that has been effected in this respect during the last decade in this our fostering city of Rome, and in many churches of our country, but in a more especial way among some nations in which eminent men, full of zeal for the worship of God, have, with the approval of the Holy See and under the direction of the Bishops, united in encouraging societies and restored sacred music to the fullest honor in all their churches and chapels. Still the good work that has been done is very far indeed from being common to all, and when we consult our own personal experience and take into account the great number of complaints that have reached us during the short time that has elapsed since it pleased the Lord to elevate our humility to the supreme summit of the Roman Pontificate, we consider it our first duty, without further delay, to raise our voice at once in reproof and condemnation of all that is seen to be out of harmony with the right rule above indicated, in the functions of public worship and in the performance of the ecclesiastical offices. Filled as we are with a most ardent desire to see the true Christian spirit flourish in every respect and be preserved by all the faithful, we deem it necessary to provide before aught else for the sanctity and dignity of the temple, in which the faithful assemble for no other object than that of acquiring this spirit from its foremost and indispensable fount, which is the active participation in the most holy mysteries and in the public and solemn prayer of the Church. And it is vain to hope that the blessing of heaven will descend abundantly upon us, when our homage to the Most High, instead of ascending in the odor of sweetness, puts into the hand of the Lord the scourges wherewith of old the Divine Redeemer drove the unworthy profaners from the Temple.

Hence, in order that no one in future may be able to plead in excuse that he did not clearly understand his duty, and in order that all vagueness may be eliminated from the interpretation of matters which have already been commanded, we have deemed it expedient to point out briefly the principles regulating sacred music in the functions of public worship, and to gather together in a general survey the principal prescriptions of the Church against the more common abuses in this subject. We do therefore publish, *motu proprio* and with certain knowledge, our present *Instruction*, to which, as *to a juridical code of sacred music* (*quasi a codice giuridice della musica sacra*), we will, with the fulness of our Apostolic Authority, that the force of law be given, and we do by our present handwriting impose its scrupulous observance on all.

INSTRUCTION ON SACRED MUSIC.

I.—General Principles.

1. Sacred Music, being a complementary part of the solemn liturgy, participates in the general scope of the liturgy, which is the glory of God and the sanctification and edification of the faithful. It contributes to the decorum and splendor of the ecclesiastical ceremonies, and since its principal office is to clothe with suitable melody the liturgical text proposed for the understanding of the faithful, its proper aim is to add greater efficacy to the text, in order that through it the faithful may be the more easily moved to devotion and better disposed for the reception of the fruits of grace belonging to the celebration of the most holy mysteries.

2. Sacred music should consequently possess, in the highest degree, the qualities proper to the liturgy, and precisely *sanctity* and *goodness of form*, from which its other character of *universality* spontaneously springs.

It must be *holy*, and must, therefore, exclude all profanity not only in itself, but in the manner in which it is presented by those who execute it.

It must be true art, for otherwise it will be impossible for it to exercise on the minds of those who listen to it that efficacy which the Church aims at obtaining in admitting into her liturgy the art of musical sounds.

But it must, at the same time, be universal in the sense that, while every nation is permitted to admit into its ecclesiastical compositions those special forms which may be said to constitute its native music, still these forms must be subordinated in such a manner to the general characteristics of sacred music that nobody of any nation may receive an impression other than good on hearing them.

II.—The Different Kinds of Sacred Music.

3. These qualities are to be found, in the highest degree, in the Gregorian Chant, which is, consequently, the chant proper to the Roman Church, the only chant she has inherited from the ancient fathers, which she has jealously guarded for centuries in her liturgical codices, which she prescribes exclusively for some parts of the liturgy, and which the most recent studies have so happily restored to their integrity and purity.

On these grounds the Gregorian Chant has always been regarded as the supreme model for sacred music, so that it is quite proper to lay down the following rule: *the more closely a composition for church approaches in its movement, inspiration, and savor to the Gregorian form, the more sacred and liturgical it becomes; and the more out of harmony it is with that supreme model, the less worthy is it of the temple.*

The ancient traditional Gregorian Chant must, therefore, be largely restored to the function of public worship, and everybody must take for certain that an ecclesiastical function loses nothing of its solemnity when it is accompanied by no other music but this.

Special efforts are to be made to restore the use of the Gregorian Chant by the people, so that the faithful may again take a more active part in ecclesiastical offices, as was the case in ancient times.

4. The above-mentioned qualities are also possessed in an excellent degree by the classic polyphony, especially of the Roman School, which reached its greatest perfection in the fifteenth century, owing to the works of Pierluigi da Palestrina, and continued subsequently to produce compositions of excellent quality from the liturgical and musical standpoint. The classic polyphony agrees admirably with Gregorian Chant, the supreme

model of all sacred music, and hence it has been found worthy of a place side by side with the Gregorian Chant in the more solemn functions of the Church, such as those of the Pontifical Chapel. This, too, must, therefore, be restored largely in ecclesiastical functions, especially in the more important basilicas, in cathedrals, and in the churches and chapels of seminaries and other ecclesiastical institutions in which the necessary means are not lacking.

5. The Church has always recognized and favored the progress of the arts, admitting to the service of the cult everything good and beautiful discovered by genius in the course of ages—always, however, with due regard to the liturgical laws. Consequently modern music is also admitted in the Church, since it, too, furnishes compositions of such excellence, sobriety, and gravity, that they are in no way unworthy of the liturgical functions.

Since, however, modern music has risen mainly to serve profane uses, greater care must be taken with regard to it, in order that the musical compositions of modern style which are admitted in the Church may contain nothing profane, be free from reminiscences of motifs adopted in the theatres, and be not fashioned even in their external forms after the manner of profane pieces.

6. Among the different kinds of modern music that which appears less suitable for accompanying the functions of public worship is the theatrical style, which was in its greatest vogue, especially in Italy, during the last century. This of its very nature is diametrically opposed to the Gregorian Chant and the classic polyphony, and, therefore, to the most important law of good music. Besides the intrinsic structure, the rhythm and what is known as the *conventionalism* of this style adapt themselves but poorly to the requirements of true liturgical music.

III.—The Liturgical Text.

7. The language proper to the Roman Church is Latin. Hence it is forbidden to sing anything whatever in the vernacular in solemn liturgical functions—much more to sing in the vernacular the variable or common parts of the Mass and Office.

8. As the texts that may be rendered in music, and the order in which they are to be rendered, are determined for every

liturgical function, it is not lawful to confuse this order or to change the prescribed texts for others selected at will, or to omit them either entirely or even in part, except when the rubrics allow that some versicles of the text be supplied with the organ, while these versicles are simply recited in choir. It is permissible, however, according to the custom of the Roman Church, to sing a motett to the Blessed Sacrament after the *Benedictus* in a Solemn Mass. It is also permitted, after the Offertory prescribed for the Mass has been sung, to execute during the time that remains a brief motett to words approved by the Church.

9. The liturgical text must be sung as it is in the books, without alteration or inversion of the words, without undue repetition, without breaking syllables, and always in a manner intelligible to the faithful who listen.

IV.—External Form of the Sacred Compositions.

10. The different parts of the Mass and the Office must retain, even musically, that particular concept and form which ecclesiastical tradition has assigned to them, and which is admirably expressed in the Gregorian Chant. Different, therefore, must be the method of composing an *introit*, a *gradual*, an *antiphon*, a *psalm*, a *hymn*, a *Gloria in excelsis*.

11. In particular the following rules are to be observed:

(*a*) The *Kyrie*, *Gloria*, *Credo*, etc., of the Mass must preserve the unity of composition proper to their text. It is not lawful, therefore, to compose them in separate pieces, in such a way that each of such pieces may form a complete composition in itself, and be capable of being detached from the rest, and substituted by another.

(*b*) In the Office of Vespers it should be the rule to follow the *Cæremoniale Episcoporum*, which prescribes the Gregorian Chant for the psalmody, and permits figured music for the versicles of the *Gloria Patri* and the hymn.

It will, nevertheless, be lawful on the greater feast days to alternate the Gregorian Chant of the choir with the so-caled *falsi-bordoni*, or with verses similarly composed in a proper manner.

It may be also allowed sometimes to render the single psalms in their entirety in music, provided the form proper to psalmody

be preserved in such compositions; that is to say, provided the singers seem to be psalmodizing among themselves, either with new motifs, or with those taken from the Gregorian Chant, or based upon it.

The psalms known as *di concerto* are, therefore, for ever excluded and prohibited.

(*c*) In the hymns of the Church the traditional form of the hymn is preserved. It is not lawful, therefore, to compose, for instance, a *Tantum ergo* in such wise that the first strophe presents a *romanza*, a *cavatina*, an *adagio*, and the *Genitori* an *allegro*.

(*d*) The antiphons of the Vespers must be, as a rule, rendered with the Gregorian melody proper to each. Should they, however, in some special case be sung in figured music, they must never have either the form of a concert melody or the fulness of a motett, or a *cantata*.

V.—The Singers.

12. With the exception of the melodies proper to the celebrant at the altar and to the ministers, which must be always sung only in Gregorian Chant, and without the accompaniment of the organ, all the rest of the liturgical chant belongs to the choir of levites, and, therefore, singers in church, even when they are laymen, are really taking the place of the ecclesiastical choir. Hence, the music rendered by them must, at least for the greater part, retain the character of choral music.

By this it is not to be understood that solos are entirely excluded. But solo singing should never predominate in such a way as to have the greater part of the liturgical chant executed in that manner; rather should it have the character of simple suggestion, or a melodic projection (*spunto*), and be strictly bound up with the rest of the choral composition.

13. On the same principle it follows that singers in church have a real liturgical office, and that therefore women, as being incapable of exercising such office, cannot be admitted to form part of the choir, or of the musical chapel. Whenever, then, it is desired to employ the high voices of sopranos and contraltos, these parts must be taken by boys, according to the most ancient usage of the Church.

14. Finally, only those are to be admitted to form part of the musical chapel of a church who are men of known piety and probity of life; and these should, by their modest and devout bearing during the liturgical functions, show that they are worthy of the holy office they exercise. It will also be fitting that singers while singing in church wear the ecclesiastical habit and surplice, and that they be hidden behind gratings when the choir is excessively open to the public gaze.

VI.—Organ and Instruments.

15. Although the music proper to the Church is purely vocal music, music with the accompaniment of the organ is also permitted. In some special cases, within due limits and propriety, other instruments may be allowed, but never without the special leave of the Ordinary, according to the prescriptions of the *Cæremoniale Episcoporum*.

16. As the chant should always have the principal place, the organ or instruments should merely sustain and never oppress it.

17. It is not permitted to have the chant preceded by long preludes, or to interrupt it with intermezzo pieces.

18. The sound of the organ as an accompaniment to the chant in preludes, and the like, must be not only governed by the special nature of the instrument, but must participate in all the qualities proper to sacred music as above enumerated.

19. The employment of the piano is forbidden in church, as is also that of loud-sounding or lighter instruments, such as drums, cymbals, bells, and the like.

20. It is strictly forbidden to have bands play in church, and only in a special case and with the consent of the Ordinary will it be permissible to admit a number of wind instruments, limited, well selected, and proportioned to the size of the place—provided the composition and the accompaniment to be executed be written in a grave and suitable style, and similar in all respects to that proper to the organ.

21. In processions outside the church the Ordinary may give permission for a band, provided no profane pieces are executed. It would be desirable in such cases that the band confine itself to

accompanying some spiritual canticle sung in Latin or in the vernacular by the singers and the pious associations which take part in the procession.

VII.—The Length of the Liturgical Chant.

22. It is not lawful to keep the priest at the altar waiting on account of the chant or the music for a length of time not allowed by the liturgy. According to the ecclesiastical prescriptions the *Sanctus* of the Mass should be over before the Elevation, and therefore the priest must here have regard to the singers. The *Gloria* and *Credo* ought, according to the Gregorian tradition, to be relatively short.

23. In general it must be considered to be a very grave abuse when the liturgy in ecclesiastical functions is made to appear secondary to and in a manner at the service of the music, for the music is merely a part of the liturgy and its humble handmaid.

VIII.—Principal Means.

24. For the exact execution of what has been herein laid down, the Bishops, if they have not already done so, are to institute in their dioceses a special Commission composed of persons really competent in sacred music, and to this Commission let them intrust in the manner they find most suitable the task of watching over the music executed in their churches. Nor are they to see merely that the music is good in itself, but also that it is adapted to the powers of the singers and be always well executed.

25. In seminaries of clerics and in ecclesiastical institutions let the above-mentioned traditional Gregorian Chant be cultivated by all with diligence and love, according to the Tridentine prescriptions, and let the superiors be liberal of encouragement and praise toward their young subjects. In like manner let a *Schola Cantorum* be established, whenever possible, among the clerics for the execution of sacred polyphony and of good liturgical music.

26. In the ordinary lessons of Liturgy, Morals, Canon Law, given to the students of theology, let care be taken to touch on those points which regard more directly the principles and laws of sacred music, and let an attempt be made to complete the doctrine with some particular instruction in the æsthetic side of the sacred art, so that the clerics may not leave the seminary unfamiliar with all those notions, necessary as they are for complete ecclesiastical culture.

27. Let care be taken to restore, at least in the principal churches, the ancient *Scholae Cantorum*, as has been done with excellent fruit in a great many places. It is not difficult for a zealous clergy to institute such *Scholae* even in the minor and country churches—nay, in them they will find a very easy means for gathering around them both the children and the adults, to their own profit and the edification of the people.

28. Let efforts be made to support and promote in the best way possible the higher schools of sacred music where these already exist, and to help in founding them where they do not. It is of the utmost importance that the Church herself provide for the instruction of its masters, organists, and singers, according to the true principles of sacred art.

XI.—Conclusion.

29. Finally, it is recommended to choir-masters, singers, members of the clergy, superiors of seminaries, ecclesiastical institutions, and religious communities, parish priests and rectors of churches, canons of collegiate churches and cathedrals, and, above all, to the diocesan Ordinaries, to favor with all zeal these prudent reforms, long desired and demanded with united voice by all ; so that the authority of the Church, which herself has repeatedly proposed them, and now inculcates them, may not fall into contempt.

Given from our Apostolic Palace at the Vatican, on the day of the Virgin and Martyr, St. Cecilia, November 22, 1903, in the first year of our Pontificate.

Pius X, Pope.

LIBRARY OF ST. JOHN'S
BOSTON ECCLESIASTICAL SEMINARY,
BRIGHTON, MASS.

THE REFORM OF CHURCH MUSIC IN ROME.

In connection with the Encyclical Letter to all the faithful regarding the character and the reformation of music in our churches, the Holy Father addresses a separate instruction to the Cardinal Vicar of Rome. In this instruction Pope Pius X says:

1. that since the reform is necessary, it should begin at Rome where the present abuses are a source of special scandal, and where good example of the correct practice is to be set for the rest of the Christian world;

2. the Cardinal Vicar is to take active steps to have the reform introduced in every parish church, beginning with the great basilicas;

3. that this reform implies that the liturgical offices—Mass, Litanies, Vespers, etc., are to be carried out as prescribed by the ritual of the Church; and that in place of long musical programmes at the evening services the simple Vesper devotion is to be restored, with an instruction, if time allows, and Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament;

4. finally, that the seminaries and colleges in Rome are to provide instruction in the liturgical chant, so that through the alumni the correct mode may be carried into different mission countries for which they are ordained. "There are," says the Holy Father, "some seminaries and colleges which leave much to be desired, owing to the carelessness of the superiors, or the want of capacity and the imperfect taste of the persons to whom the teaching of the chant and the direction of the sacred music is entrusted. You, Lord Cardinal, will be good enough to provide for us a remedy for this also with solicitude, by insisting especially that Gregorian Chant, according to the prescriptions of the Council of Trent, and of innumerable other Councils, provincial and diocesan, in all parts of the world, be studied with particular diligence, and be as a rule preferred in the public and private functions of the institute. It is true that in other times the Gregorian Chant was known to most only through books which were incorrect, vitiated, and curtailed. But the accurate and prolonged study that has been given to it by eminent men who have done a great service to sacred art has changed the face of things. The Gregorian

Chant restored in such a satisfactory way to its early purity, as it was handed down by the Fathers and is found in the codices of the various churches, is sweet, soft, easy to learn, and of a beauty so fresh and full of surprises, that wherever it has been introduced it has never failed to excite real enthusiasm in the youthful singers. Now, when delight enters into the fulfilment of duty, everything is done with greater alacrity and with more lasting fruit. It is our will, therefore, that in all seminaries and colleges in this fostering City there be introduced once more the most ancient Roman chant which used to resound in our churches and basilicas, and which formed the delight of past generations in the fairest days of Christian piety. And as in former times that chant was spread abroad over the whole Western Church from Rome, so we desire that our young clerics, educated under our own eyes, will carry it with them and diffuse it again in their own dioceses when they return thither as priests to work for the glory of God. We are overjoyed to be able to give these regulations at a time when we are about to celebrate the thirteenth centenary of the death of the glorious and incomparable Pontiff, St. Gregory the Great, to whom an ecclesiastical tradition dating back many centuries has attributed the composition of these sacred melodies, and from whom they have derived their name. Let our dearly-beloved youth exercise themselves in them, for it will be sweet to us to hear them when, as we have been told will be the case, they will assemble at the coming centenary celebrations round the tomb of the Holy Pontiff in the Vatican Basilica during the Sacred Liturgy which, please God, will be celebrated by us on the auspicious occasion."

THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW and THE DOLPHIN hope in subsequent numbers to bring articles on this important subject which will facilitate the practical introduction of the grand old music of the Church by furnishing all those who are interested in the subject with information of sources and methods, as well as with suggestions of a helpful character.

A NOBLE WORK AND A GENEROUS SUGGESTION.

There appeared in the January number of THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW an article by the Rev. James Anthony Walsh,

Director of the "Society for the Propagation of the Faith" in the Archdiocese of Boston. The author makes clear the aims of the society as a *provider* of alms and prayers for the foreign missions of the Catholic Church. The missionary army benefited by the work of the Society comprises 65,000 men and women (made up of 15,000 priests, 5,000 brothers, 45,000 nuns) who are waging our battles now beyond the frontiers of civilization, struggling to take away the blush of shame which the world's census brings to the cheek of every fervent Catholic, when he reads that to-day of a population of 1,500,000,000 more than 1,000,000,000 of our fellow-beings have never heard of Jesus Christ! To secure alms and prayers for these heroes and heroines is, then, the aim of the Society for the Propagation of the Faith.

The Society was founded in the year 1822. The occasion of its birth was the extreme need of a diocese in the United States (New Orleans) whose newly consecrated bishop, returning from Rome, had stopped at Lyons on his way, and appealed for some organized form of help. One Madame Petit, a former resident of the United States, took up the idea, but it remained for a young woman, Mlle. Jaricot, also of Lyons, to begin the work in earnest. Miss Jaricot's brother, a seminarian, had interested her in the cause of Foreign Missions, and she began to enlist members who gave one cent a week, and who soon numbered more than one thousand.

Since its foundation it has collected and dispensed $68,355,-359. Of this amount more than ten million dollars have come to America to help needy and struggling missions. The bulk of the contributions has come from France,—$43,640,081; from Germany and Austria, $6,033,117; from Italy, $5,382,345; Belgium, $3,701,140; and from Great Britain and Ireland, $2,362,573.

Owing to the constant and widely known encouragement of Archbishop Williams, who commissioned the Rev. Dr. Joseph V. Tracy to interest himself in the work of the Society, the Archdiocese of Boston raised last year $28,086.31 (which amount includes a legacy, with interest, of $5,587.50), that is to say, nearly one-third of the whole amount, $85,408, contributed in all the dioceses of the United States. Father Walsh directs attention also to the zeal displayed by the Protestant Missions and the money contributed to their support.

The article elicited most favorable comment from a number of priests, one of whom, on having read it, promptly sent us an encouraging communication enclosing a check for one hundred dollars. This fact we take the liberty of publishing in THE DOLPHIN, partly because THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW had already gone to press when we received the communication (which obliges us to hold it over for the March issue of that magazine), and partly because we hope that some generous readers of THE DOLPHIN may be inspired by a like motive to the one expressed in the following letter:

To the Editor of THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

Rev. Dear Sir:—Having just finished reading the article in the current issue of the REVIEW, entitled "The Society for the Propagation of the Faith in the Archdiocese of Boston," by the Rev. Director of that Society, I can not resist the impulse of tendering both to him and to the REVIEW my sincere thanks for the wholly admirable account given of the general work of the Society and of that portion of it limited to the Archdiocese of Boston. I am not indeed in the position of that "new-found friend" who, on being introduced to Father Walsh as the Director of the "Society for the Propagation of the Faith," cried out: "The *what?* . . . I suppose this is another of our religious fads. God help us! What is the Church coming to?" For I recall that, even as a child, I was made dimly aware of the existence of such a Society by coming across stacks of the "Annals of the Propagation of the Faith" at home; so that I suppose that my father must have been an annual subscriber to the fund. And yet to my shame must I confess that added years failed to bring added wisdom; for although I knew that the United States had received from the Society nearly six times as much financial help as these same States had contributed to its fund, and that therefore, under God, much of the present flourishing condition of Catholicity here is due to the notably large donations of money made by that Society to the missions in the United States, still I had to wait for the clear, simple, unemotional, business-like presentation of Father Walsh's paper in the REVIEW, to "wince" like that "galled jade" whose withers are not unwrung. In asking you to do me the kindness of sending the enclosed check to the Society, I am making both a tardy and a partial reparation for my neglect. And I am emboldened

to make the following suggestion: That the REVIEW lend itself to the good work by opening a subscription list, so that the thousands of others who, like myself, have not had the subject presented with sufficient insistence to their minds and hearts, and whose tardiness may be due as much to ignorance as to negligence, may have an easy opportunity opened out to them for aiding, both by prayers and money, the grand work of "teaching all nations" and "preaching the Gospel to every creature."

IGNAVUS.

January 24, 1904.

As to the suggestion made by the writer, that a subscription list be opened in the pages of the REVIEW, we think that its object will be fully met if we direct attention to the *Annals* published by the Director of the Society in the United States. This work, under the management of the Rev. Fr. Frèri, Baltimore, has been mentioned from time to time in these pages and deserves the active interest of every high-minded Catholic, priest or layman.

THE ORIGIN OF THE "TE DEUM."

Qu. I read in the current number of the *Cosmopolitan* the following account of the origin and authorship of the "Te Deum":

"The *Te Deum*, the greatest of all songs of praise, was not in existence until the year A. D. 387. The story runs that Saint Ambrose stood before a Christian altar in Milan. Saint Augustine, that most interesting convert to the new faith, stood by him; in joy of the latter's conversion St. Ambrose broke forth into thanksgiving: 'We praise Thee, oh God!' And St. Augustine, inspired likewise, answered: 'All the earth doth worship Thee, the Father everlasting.' It is told that these two men sang alternately the verses of the great hymn before the altar. It is to-day, as it has been for centuries, the Church's voice of joy and praise. Some authorities, however, place the writing of the *Te Deum* in the sixth century."

Would you kindly state if this account of the great hymn may be received as correct?

F. W.

Resp. The view that St. Ambrose and St. Augustine are the authors, singly or conjointly, of the *Te Deum* has long been abandoned by students of hymnology. The legend rests upon a Gallican tradition, and appears to have originated from the title-

phrase given to the hymn in a few ancient Psalter manuscripts. Thus the Imperial Library of Vienna possesses a MS. Codex presented by Charlemagne to Pope Hadrian in which the *Te Deum* is introduced as *Hymnus quem S. Ambrosius et S. Augustinus invicem condiderunt*—the hymn which St. Ambrose and St. Augustine composed alternately.

It has been generally admitted, however, that the hymn antedates the sixth century. The omission of the "chorus confessorum" and "virginum" indicates a composition of a time before the Canonical Office had attained its development in the monastic choral service of St. Benedict. Moreover, the records indicating the authorship of Nicetius, Bishop of Trèves in the sixth century, are very obscure. The learned Benedictine Dom Morin brings argument to show that the hymn was in use already during the middle of the fifth century, and thinks it might be attributed to St. Nicetas of Aquileja, or to Abundius, Bishop of Como, both of whom lived during the pontificate of Leo I. It is certain that it had been introduced into the Roman Office before the time of Pope Gregory the Great.

But whilst it is not at all clear that the two great Western Doctors of the Church are the actual authors of the hymn, there is good reason to believe that its origin is traceable at least to the influence of St. Ambrose; perhaps in the same manner as is the case with many of the psalms attributed to David, although they were actually written at a much later date by the "Sons of Kore." We know that St. Ambrose was the first to introduce into the public service of Milan the regular antiphonal chant, which gradually found its way later into the Roman and Gaulish churches. Whether the first suggestion of it had come to him from the practice of the Greek patriarchal communities, or whether it was one of those inspirations which so frequently seized the royal singer of Bethlehem, is difficult to determine; but we can easily picture to ourselves St. Ambrose and St. Augustine setting about the composition and the chanting for the catechumens a profession of faith such as the *Te Deum* expresses. This profession of faith in form of a hymn of thanksgiving, which the newly baptized were to be taught to chant in alternate verses, might easily take its name from St. Ambrose. It was a most fitting song for the

Bishop and his presbyter Augustine, who acted as antiphonarian at the public functions to intone before the congregation, in the days when the regular Gregorian Chant had not yet been introduced into the cathedral churches of Italy. Thus, both the profession of faith and the manner of chanting it were no doubt gradually perfected and became universal during the hundred years following the rule of St. Ambrose, who was remembered as the first great patron of the antiphonal Church music, together with the disciple who by his inspirations no less than by his labor assisted him for a time in the establishment of that glorious liturgy of which the *Te Deum*, as we have received it from the early Church, is a standing monument.

THE PAULINE PRIVILEGE IN THE CASE OF PROTESTANTS.

Qu. In your last number an interesting marriage case was discussed, in which the possibility of a separation of the parties by the Pauline Privilege was suggested. This leads me to propose a similar case with however an important difference, namely, that the baptized party did not profess the Catholic faith, but remained a Protestant.

A young woman who was in the habit of visiting a Catholic family, married an infidel. She herself had never been baptized, and, of course, the marriage was valid (by natural contract). Her husband somehow did not fancy her frequenting Catholic society, as he had a bitter prejudice against the local priest, whom his wife had once or twice met at the house of her friends, and of whom she seemed to have a high esteem, which she did not think of disguising from her husband.

In course of time she felt the desire to become a Catholic. Her friends encouraged her, and one of the young ladies of the family instructed her. A few months later, when the priest was on the point of baptizing her, he received a most insulting and threatening letter from the husband, saying that he would appeal for a divorce from his wife, and prosecute the priest, for alienation, etc. Under the circumstances, the priest advised that the ceremony of baptism should be deferred until the matter could be placed in the proper light, and avoid a rupture between the young married people. The young woman, however, in her first fervor, insisted that she be received into the Church, declaring herself ready to brave the indignation of her

husband rather than yield to his unreasonable and insulting prejudices. It was at this juncture that the priest gave her to understand that there would be no necessity of her incurring such martyrdom, but that, in the event of her being baptized, and her husband refusing peacefully to live with her, she might be declared free from the marriage-bond, and could, if she desired later, marry a Catholic husband. He urged her, however, to wait, thinking that the husband might in time change his mind, since he showed a certain fondness for his wife and a readiness to indulge her enthusiastic but rather whimsical disposition in all other respects. She consented to defer her baptism for a time. A year passed, and nothing more was done. Meantime there were some changes in the relation of her Catholic friends, and the former visits of the lady ceased. The following Easter morning the priest was informed that Mrs. N., the prospective zealous convert to Catholicism, had been baptized the previous day in the Episcopalian church, and that the rector (very High Church) had endorsed the idea which the priest had suggested, namely, that in case of trouble from the husband, she could be divorced from him, if he did not like her Christianity. As a matter of fact, a short time after this, the two secured a civil divorce.

Later on, this lady meets a Catholic man who wishes to marry her. She is still a Protestant, though validly baptized. Does the Pauline Privilege, as regarded by the Church, apply to her, a baptized Protestant, so as to free her from the obligation of her first marriage? Or, has she to become a Catholic before the new marriage could be ratified by the Church? Is it necessary to make the formal interpellation in such a case, if it is known that the infidel husband has married again in the meantime, thus indicating his permanent unwillingness to resume relations with his former wife?

Resp. The Pauline Privilege applies to all validly baptized persons who accept the Christian faith, even if that faith be erroneous. Hence a validly baptized Protestant would be free to marry another baptized person, if her former infidel consort refuses to tolerate the Christian religion. In the present case, the woman ought to become a Catholic, otherwise there would be necessity of a dispensation from the impediment of mixed religion for the Catholic man who wishes to marry her. There is hardly room for interpellation, since the former infidel husband has bound himself by a second marriage, whether validly or invalidly, which sufficiently expresses his intention.

WORKS OF THE ABBÉ LOISY ON THE INDEX.

After a long period of uncertainty as to what Rome might do in view of the outspoken attitude of the Abbé Loisy regarding the authenticity and interpretation of the Scriptural deposit of revealed truth, there comes at last a clearly defined decision which every Catholic scholar will feel bound to respect and accept as just.

Stress has been laid by the friends of the Abbé upon two things that up to the present seemed to lend favor to his position. He had taken up the warfare against modern rationalistic criticism in the spirit of an apologist who realizes the necessity of fighting an opponent with arms equal in kind and reach to his own. To oppose mere tradition against scientific investigation is like combating a man who confronts you with a pistol by means of a stout stick. And here P. Loisy has unquestionably achieved much success, if in no other way than that he gained a respectful hearing from those who believe that Catholics discard all pretence of appealing to reason when they have antiquity for their shield. Our contention is, in their eyes, the fight of an hereditary aristocracy without merit against the intellectual aristocracy of the day.

But there are limits to the exercise of skill or valor, even in the midst of battle. The discipline of the Catholic Church, like that of an army, is for the common good, and the common good may be jeopardized by the indiscreet zeal of an individual, however meritorious. In the attempt to popularize opinions which concern the gravest of all subjects—primitive revelation—the authenticity of the history and teaching of the Gospels—the lines that touch the divine and the human nature of our Lord—these and the important conclusions in the life and organic action of the Church which rest upon these facts, it easily occurs that we leave impressions which are disastrous to the faith of thousands who cannot verify the new teaching or test its value by any standard except their own limited knowledge or bent. And as we do not teach children things which, however true they may be, might engender a skepticism in them regarding the necessity of order, respect for authority, or any other social or personal virtue, so the Church, in order to guard the lambs of the flock, does not

permit the roaming at will in their midst of those who, without intention to harm, disturb nevertheless the quiet and order of the fold.

There is indeed, without question, an opposite extreme to be found in the attitude of those who decry all criticism, and who believe that Catholic conservative methods demand an absolutely literal adoption of the historical tradition represented in the Sacred Scriptures and in the ecclesiastical writers of the past eighteen centuries. And if the representatives of this school made themselves most felt in the opposition to Loisy, it may have served to stay the decision of Rome against his all too forward utterances during the last years of Leo XIII's pontificate, when the case of Loisy had been repeatedly represented as provoking legitimate censure, at the instance, it is generally understood, of the Cardinal Archbishop of Paris.

In any event, the Holy See has been very deliberate in examining and pronouncing upon the Abbé Loisy's work. If he has had opponents of his views, he also has had staunch defenders in Rome; of this there can be no doubt. Hence the decision of the Sacred Congregation is the more reassuring, and we may confidently take sides against views which both in their immediate results and in the manner in which they have been put forth, intimate danger to Catholic faith and virtue.

No doubt there will be the "wise men from the West," not sympathizing with the Church, to tell us that "Rome has allowed itself once more to come under the spell of the Jesuits as in so many other cases," and that the name of Cardinal Steinhuber as Prefect of the Index Congregation is a clear proof of this. The old shadowy images of Rome gagging her progressive men will be revived with added venom to poison the minds of the public. Perhaps the discontented will say that the Index has in times past had to reverse its decisions, to eliminate certain of its censures, and even to tone down its general laws to make them effective; and that the day may come in which the Abbé Loisy's position may be justified in the face of the Catholic world.

This, however, can never be true. Even if, from a critical point of view, all the contentions and statements and conjectures of the Abbé were some day proved correct, yet would he still be

in the wrong. The Church deals with the present Abbé, not with his opinions as they might affect society a hundred years hence. She condemns him to-day, because his statements not only lack sufficiently convincing proofs, though he himself may feel an instinctive certainty regarding them, but because they are an injury to the children of her household. If ever the Church felt called upon to reverse her decisions, it was never because those whom she censured were in the right at the time, but because the continuation of the censure might be either misapplied to new conditions, or because it had lost its purpose, and could only serve to embarrass the student of her laws.

We know, then, that we must avoid to adopt, disseminate, or defend the views put forth by the Abbé Loisy in the works placed on the Index. The skeptic spirit which they awaken does not lie in any one statement, but in the doubts which the author incidentally casts upon the divine manifestations of our Lord both in prophecy and in the New Testament history vouched for as substantially inspired.

The works by the Abbé Loisy, specified in the present Decree (December 23, 1903) of the Index Congregation are:

La Religion d'Israel (Decr. S. O. 16 Dec.).
L'Évangile ét l'Église.
Études Évangéliques.
Autour d'un petit livre.
Le quatrième Évangile.

The work which has probably furnished the best evidence of Monsieur Loisy's heterodox tendencies is the one entitled *L'Évangile et l'Église.* The Abbé Monchamp, Vicar-General of Liège, has undertaken a very close analysis of the volume, in which he points out the impossibility of escaping the conclusion which places Loisy in direct opposition to the authoritative teaching of the Church. Not only is the historical authorship of the Gospels questioned, but the evangelical statements are so interpreted as to lose their dogmatic value. This means a subversion of the theological basis on which the entire constitution of the Church rests. The arguments on which both the traditional doctrines and Conciliar or Pontifical decisions, in matters of faith and morals, mainly depend for their primary motive, are drawn from

the evangelical teaching of the New Testament. According to the Abbé Loisy, this teaching has not the value of indisputable fact, but simply of a creed, that is to say, as an expression of what was believed by those who wrote the records which we call the inspired Gospels. "*L'argument biblique est en réalité un argument de tradition*," he writes in the brochure *Autour d'un petit livre* (p. 175), which is an explanatory letter addressed to a Catholic apologist, in which the Abbé reviews the subject of the foundation and authority of the Church as indicated in the previous work already mentioned.

But the significance of the condemnation lies in the adjustment which it suggests to those who are inclined to speculate on the theme of revelation. The touchstone of orthodoxy must forever remain the voice of the Church as it reaches us from the Watch-tower on the Rock of St. Peter.

A CASE OF ANGLICAN BAPTISM.

Qu. A child is validly baptized, privately, by a Protestant clergyman.

Later the child is publicly received, according to the Anglican rite; and godparents are named.

Later still the child is received into the Catholic Church; and not only are the ceremonies supplied, but, according to the wish of the parish priest, conditional baptism is given, and a godparent named.

Yet, as was said above, the first baptism was valid.

Suppose it to be so—then who are the child's godparents? Has he any?

Is there any objection to one of the Protestant godparents calling himself so?

Resp. If a child is validly baptized, no matter by whom, it is not to be again baptized. This is the law of the Church, to be observed under pain of censure.

But it is a grave question in a matter of such importance whether or not the baptism administered by those who are not under the discipline of the Catholic Church is in particular cases valid. Among Anglicans, as with most religious bodies separated

from the Church, there is a great diversity of opinion and practice regarding this Sacrament. Some do undoubtedly observe the form prescribed as valid, but of this the authorized discipline, even in Anglican churches, gives no certain guarantee; and a parish priest to assure himself of the valid administration must have unquestionable or ocular testimony in each separate case. This is the general rule ordained as a matter of precaution in practice: converts are to be *conditionally* rebaptized when, after due investigation, there is any doubt whatever in regard to the validity of the previous baptism.

Assuming however that the baptism administered in the Anglican Church was unquestionably valid, it is quite proper that the ceremonies of the Catholic ritual should be supplied, after the child has been received into the Catholic Church. And the reason for this is that the ceremonial of the Church, partly symbolical and partly sacramental (*i. e.*, communicating grace through the prayers and blessings of the Church), is the language of her whom Christ has established as His Bride and to whom He has communicated the virtue of that prayer which excludes disunion or separation from her Head. The efficacy of the Catholic ritual rests upon the union even *in non-essentials* with the administrative or disciplinary direction of the Church. It is her prayer, her blessing directly descending from Christ through her as the legitimate channel of church government, that gives value to our sacramentals, as distinguished from the Sacraments. The Sacrament of Baptism operates by the inherent virtue of the rite itself *instituted by Christ* to effect grace. But the sacramentals or ceremonies derive their virtue solely from the intercession of the Church which *represents Christ.* In this sense the Anglican or any Protestant ceremonial has no value except by its symbolism, for it does not represent the language or functions of the true Church.

For a similar reason the godparent named for the child in the Anglican Church cannot be accepted in the Catholic Church. It is true that the Anglican who is validly baptized is marked thereby with the seal of the Christian profession, and thus *per se* becomes capable of accepting the charge which the office of godparent imposes upon him. That office implies the solemnly accepted obligation of instructing the child in the Christian faith and in

Christian life, if, through any accident, the parents themselves should fail or be prevented from performing this duty.

Now as an Anglican, although a professed disciple of Christ, if he be sincere in his own belief, will hardly consent to instruct the child or the convert in a faith and practice from which he dissents, but which the parents and the child or convert hold to be the only true expression of Christ's will and teaching, it is obvious why the priest and the Catholic parents alike, as well as the child or convert, cannot accept with any consistency a godparent who will not be a true substitute for God or the parents.

If, on the other hand, it be urged that a baptized Anglican might consent to have the child instructed in the Roman Catholic faith or practice, believing in the "branch theory" of the Church, we would answer that such a disposition is possible from his point of view; but since his very theory prevents him from realizing the importance of certain doctrines and practices which Roman Catholics hold as essential, he is not a godfather to be entrusted with so serious a charge, to which he could hardly be true except in intention.

The remaining questions thus answer themselves.

Protestants as God-parents at Baptism of Catholic Children.

In our mixed community life it frequently happens that Catholic parents feel under some obligation, if it be not a mere inclination, of placing their children under the patronage of some friend to whom they are attached, but who is not of the same faith. This is especially true of what are called people of good society. They feel at liberty to ask those with whom they are on sufficiently intimate terms, professionally or socially, to become sponsors at baptism for their child. Few persons object; it is to them a matter of form; and if it is a religious ceremony, it does not require anything more than attendance at church, and at most the gift of a silver spoon. On the other hand, those who make the request cherish perhaps a vague idea that they have made connections which will serve them, or their child, at a later date in practical life.

Such are probably most often the underlying motives with

Catholics who seek the sponsorship of non-Catholic friends for their newly-baptized children. In other cases it is the desire not to displease relatives or close associates; or simply a want of knowledge as to the meaning of the baptismal rite and the duty of a godparent.

The question naturally occurs: Can a Catholic invite or accept a Protestant as godparent for his child? or, What if, as in the case of converts, the circumstances indicate that the omission to invite a Protestant intimate to act as godparent would cause enmity and serious domestic difficulties to the newly baptized which might seem to outweigh the service which a Catholic godparent, however pious, could do the neophyte at any time? The answer is that since a godfather, in the only permissible Catholic sense, is a person who takes the position of a parent, assuming the responsibility *to foster the spiritual life of the catechumen in the Catholic faith*, there can be no more question of a Protestant acting as godparent to a Catholic child or catechumen, than there is of a Protestant assuming the function of the ministering priest, under the assumption that laymen are equally ordained to the same rights.

Sensible Protestants who are made to understand the obligation of a godfather in the Catholic Church will of their own accord refuse to accept it; and sensible Catholics will easily find a way to make the obligation clear to Protestant friends who might have a wrong view of the situation.

But suppose a case where circumstances prevent any such just understanding on both sides, and that grave reasons appear to urge the necessity of inviting a non-Catholic to assist at the baptism of a Catholic child. In such a case it may be remembered that there is no law preventing *the presence* of a Protestant at the baptismal ceremony; he can only be edified if the rite be properly performed; and he may there learn to understand why his share in the act is a merely *passive* one. He cannot be sponsor or godfather, though he might imagine himself such, and there is no particular reason to disturb his imagination. What he cares for, principally, is to be invited as patron of the child, and the sense of that patronage may easily be limited to one of assistance at the function of baptism and later in temporals or of honor.

In all such cases it is necessary that there be at least one Catholic godparent who becomes, before God and the Church, responsible for the instruction of the child in the true faith whenever necessity calls for this service.

A priest might even enter the names of Protestant witnesses to the baptism in the official Register, duly noting their dissent from our faith, for their testimony may be useful in civil and testamentary relations; nor is such action, when, in exceptional cases, advised by prudence, to be considered as an unworthy compromise or a communication in sacred things with Protestants. Protestants may come to our service—though it was not always so, owing to the fear of disturbance and irreverence in the days of the *arcanum*—although we cannot go to theirs, if our going is likely to be, or to be interpreted as, a recognition of their mode of worship, which we hold and know to be different from that which God has ordained for our observance through Christ and His Church.

THE VOTIVE MASS ON THE EIGHTH DAY OF THE MONTH.

Qu. Monsignor Lynch's suggestions made in last month's Review regarding the monthly devotion in honor of the Immaculate Conception during this Jubilee year of the Definition of the Dogma will no doubt lead to a more impressive appreciation of the devotion; and I, for one, mean to introduce it in my congregation. The young women of the Sodality of the Blessed Virgin are glad to take up the Little Office of the Immaculate Conception, and to attend at the Mass, so as to make the eighth day of each month a regular parish feast in honor of Our Lady.

However, I fear there may be some difficulty about the Ordo of the Mass. The general rubrics are of course given, but many of your readers have not the training to arrange it properly without some direction. Thus in January we were puzzled what Mass to say. It was the third day within the Octave of the Epiphany, which is privileged, and excludes votive Masses, simple commemorations, etc. Was the votive oration to be said, in place of the *Deus qui salutis*, and under one conclusion with the oration of the Epiphany; or had it a separate conclusion?

The Ordos have not taken notice of the possible changes, and

many of us will be at sea in this regard on each eighth day of the next eleven months.

Resp. The following table, drawn up by the Rev. W. Faerber, in his excellent *Pastoralblatt* for December, will answer the above-mentioned difficulty. The arrangement is made primarily with reference to the St. Louis Ordo, which is in the main the Roman Ordo used in a large number of dioceses in the United States. In nearly every case, however, it will be found applicable also to the local Ordos of New York, Baltimore, etc.

January 8.—Mass of the Epiphany. Second Prayer (under one conclusion with the Prayer of the Epiphany) of the Immaculate Conception; third Prayer, for the Church or Pope.

February 8.—Votive Mass of the Immaculate Conception, without any Commemoration.

March 8.—Votive Mass of the Immaculate Conception, without any Commemoration.

April 8.—Mass of the Octave of Easter. Second Prayer (under one conclusion with the Prayer of Easter) of the Immaculate Conception; third Prayer, for the Church or Pope.

May 8.—Votive Mass of the Immaculate Conception, without any Commemoration.

June 8.—Votive Mass of the Immaculate Conception, without any Commemoration.

July 8.—Votive Mass of the Immaculate Conception, without any Commemoration.

August 8.—Votive Mass of the Immaculate Conception, without any Commemoration.

September 8.—Mass of the Nativity of the Bl. V. Mary; no Commemoration.

October 8.—Votive Mass of the Immaculate Conception, without any Commemoration.

November 8.—Votive Mass of the Immaculate Conception, without any Commemoration.

When the Devotion is transferred to the *following Sunday*, the *Ordo* is as follows:

January 10.—Mass of the Sunday within the Octave of Epiphany. Second Prayer (under one conclusion with the Prayer of the Sunday) of the Immaculate Conception; third Prayer, of the Octave of Epiphany.

February 14.—Votive Mass of the Immaculate Conception, without any Commemoration.

March 13.—Votive Mass of the Immaculate Conception, without any Commemoration.

April 10.—Mass of *Dominica in Albis.* Second Prayer (under one conclusion with that of the Sunday) of the Immaculate Conception.

May 8.—Votive Mass of the Immaculate Conception, without any Commemoration.

June 12.—Votive Mass of the Immaculate Conception, without any Commemoration.

July 10.—Votive Mass of the Immaculate Conception, without any Commemoration.

August 14.—Votive Mass of the Immaculate Conception, without any Commemoration.

September 11.—Mass of the Holy Name of B. V. Mary. Second Prayer of the Sunday (Sixteenth after Pentecost); third Prayer, of SS. Protus and Hyacinth, MM.

October 9.—Votive Mass of the Immaculate Conception, without any Commemoration.

November 13.—Mass of the Patronage of B. V. Mary. Second Prayer, of the Sunday (Sixth after Epiphany remaining); third Prayer, of S. Didacus.

The foregoing order applies to the principal Mass in each church or chapel said in connection with the devotion in honor of the Immaculate Conception. At all other Masses in the same churches a Commemoration of the Immaculate Conception may be added, following the principal prayer of the Mass in the usual manner prescribed for simplified feasts.

Criticisms and Notes.

THE INNER LIFE OF THE SOUL. Short Spiritual Messages for the Ecclesiastical Year. By S. L. Emery. New York, London, and Bombay: Longmans, Green, and Co. 1903. Pp. 269.

Perhaps few even of the clergy realize what immense advantages the Catholic teacher possesses for creating real and lasting happiness by means of the ceremonial and doctrines of the Church; that is to say, by the intelligent interpretation of the ecclesiastical seasons, the Sacraments and sacramentals which are part of our Catholic life. It is the routine, the mechanical performance of sacred rites, the irreverent assumption that the Sacraments save us despite ourselves, if they are only applied to us, which actually sap the strength and virtue of Catholic communities and create conditions such as provoked the so-called Reformation of the sixteenth century. Protestantism, though it cannot justify its doctrines, has a legitimate cause of protest in the neglect and in the abuse of God's fairest and saving gifts on the part of Catholics. That has indeed always been true, and in this sense there has been a reason for Protestantism in the world long before Luther came to inaugurate his emphatically marked revolt. Yet the fault, though easily explained to be a normal result of human frailty, ever recurring, does not brook any apology, least of all as a pretext for our omitting to cultivate the vital elements of Catholic doctrine and discipline as expressed in the liturgical life of the Church.

The vivifying action of the Catholic liturgy lies in the power of the individual to realize and bring home to others the personal contact which it establishes between the soul and God. Every feast of the Church, every sacramental rite, is an expression of Divine Love which calls forth the activity of the soul toward its centre and final end. Thus the order of our creation disturbed by original and actual sin is reëstablished in the heart by the right adjustment of charity; thence proceeds peace, which is the tranquillity of order.

The writer of the book before us, understanding that the greatest need of modern society is a "definite and assured faith, conjoined to a clear realization of the personal love of a personal God for each individual soul," presents to us a series of short spiritual messages for the ecclesiastical year, which are calculated to create "an answering love to God and man, thus making even the loneliest and hardest lot

an enviable one, and earth the ante-room of heaven." The earnest reader will find in these reflections "the very sunshine of life," the solution of all our social problems, the answer to all our longings, the remedy for all our ills of doubt and pain.

The author is a woman, and the readers of THE DOLPHIN are familiar with the exquisite spiritual suggestiveness of her cullings from the poetical treatment of Mount Carmel; but in this volume she combines a singularly masculine strength of thought with that delicate perception and use of devotional incentives which characterize our best spiritual writers. Dogma and piety produce this result, and thus the manner in which Miss Emery has performed her work is of itself an illustration of the theme she presents for edification.

The Inner Life of the Soul—He who cometh—The Divine Darkness of Christmas—Happy Christmas!—Our Lady of Pain—The Mystery of Pain (Circumcision), and so on, for every Sunday in the year, the beautiful subject of each day is developed in a sweetly suggestive and devotional way. The language is, as might be expected, choice, and recalls the style of Father Faber, from whom the author draws many a thought to enforce her plea for greater union with God.

It is a helpful book for the spiritual life, as well as for the preacher; and we recommend it all the more in order that it may take the place of some of the very badly written, or badly translated, spiritual reading books in common use. For Sunday readings it will be found very practical.

PROBLEMS AND PERSONS. By Wilfred Ward. London and New York: Longmans, Green & Co. Pp. liv.–377.

The qualities which have given Mr. Ward's literary work so high a reputation are everywhere apparent in his latest collection of essays. A philosophical view of history in its relations to the development of religious thought and human progress; a sobriety of judgment, the foe of extreme statements, whether in the domain of theology or of science; a wide knowledge of the motives that govern human actions and of the elements that make up the individual character; a dispassionate survey of arguments before attempting to refute them; a temper of mind that never mistakes invective for logic nor relishes the proving of a foregone conclusion,—all these rare attributes of the controversialist are to be found in the pages of the present volume, combined with a fascinating clearness of style that masks considerable depth of thought.

In the first three essays, Mr. Ward is concerned with the relationship between Catholicism and the advance of scientific knowledge. He regards the *Zeitgeist* (or Time-Spirit) of the nineteenth century as chiefly apparent in the evolutionary conception of the world and of society. This "new framework" in which we have set our notion of the universe began by throwing theology into confusion and theologians into some sort of panic. When human knowledge came to be viewed as an organic growth developing in the ratio of man's own intellectual and social development, the traditional conservatism of Catholicism embodied in its proud boast that it is "Semper eadem," in handing on from age to age the same doctrine, the same organic constitution, seemed in flat contradiction to the Time-Spirit of the century. Men rejected the teaching of faith because it seemed to be an anachronism, an interesting relic of the world's childhood, but quite incompatible with the fuller knowledge of riper manhood. In doing so they were guilty of a radical misconception. The old idea of a rigid unchangeableness of the expression is human, and so necessarily limited; language of divine and unfathomable truths was wrongly supposed to be identical with eternal *truths themselves*. The time-setting of mysteries in *formulae* that were purposely framed to meet the heresies of a particular age was confused with the finality that necessarily belongs to the message given to man from the lips of God Himself. The evolutionary theory, which was at first supposed to have destroyed forever the certainty and fixity of the doctrines of Christianity, came to be seen with fuller knowledge and saner judgment to be an ally, instead of an enemy, of orthodoxy. It had its place in the arsenal of the Church, in that it provided an answer to many difficulties once considered formidable. Alike in her interior life of faith and in her external life of organic constitution, men came to see in the Church of Christ a change from the incomplete and potential to the complete and actual, whereby she unfolded her doctrine and her organism as a Society, like the seed that becomes a flower. The law of development had scope in the history of Catholicism no less than in the various departments of human science. Nevertheless, although the gradual substitution of new expressions for old, corresponding to the needs of man's growing intelligence, was a necessary feature of its organic growth, the truths of Revelation, of which the Church was the Divine Guardian and Teacher, remained the same. The Faith of Pentecost remained the Faith of Nicæa; the Faith of Nicæa, of Chalcedon, of Ephesus, of Trent, of the Vatican

was one. A man does not change because he wears different clothes. "Just as the thinking subject remains the same while his organs of self-expression conform to the law that 'to live is to change,' so an underlying supernatural truth, ever the same, must be postulated as the living principle of theological evolution—as the reality of which successive theological developments are the part-expression."

Mr. Ward maintains that this evolutionary conception of Catholicism, as an organism developing on scientific lines from century to century, is "the acknowledged ground-work of Catholic theology, in so far as it has always maintained that successive definitions are but the express declarations, generally called for by some new heresy, of what has been contained implicitly from the first in the *depositum fidei*."

He does well to insist, in his fourth essay on Mr. Balfour's *Foundations of Belief*, that this advance in the orderly development (or the setting-forth with fuller precision) of the Christian religion is not part of a merely mechanical process, but a clear manifestation of the working of a Divine Power. It is to be regretted that he fails to point out that Protestant writers, like Auguste Sabatier and Professor Harnack, whom he claims to be in accord with his arguments in denying or obscuring this very essential feature of the true conception of religious development, cannot be considered to have much in common with the view of the history of Christian dogma maintained by Catholic theologians. No fault, however, is to be found in his singularly complete answer to the modern charge against Catholicism of a narrow bigotry that is hostile to every form alike of intellectual growth and of assimilative activity.

In the chapter on "The Rigidity of Rome," he shows that the Reformation is largely responsible for a radical change of attitude on the part of the Church. The freedom of Catholic opinion that was so characteristic of the Middle Ages when Thomist and Scotist, Dominican and Franciscan, glorified in their differences, had to be exchanged for polemical concentration against Protestantism. Luther's revolt against authority was virtually the declaration of a war that three centuries have not been able to end. Arts, science, and literature are not likely to flourish when every museum is turned into a barrack-room. Trial by jury has, similarly, to be superseded by court-martial. Everything must be sacrificed for the sake of military efficiency. The Protestant revolt had the direct effect of accentuating ecclesiastical authority to a hitherto unknown pitch. Catholicism felt

itself engaged in a life-and-death struggle ; it had to choose between destruction of itself as a corporate society and the safeguarding of its existence by a controversial (and so far narrow) theology joined with a uniformity of discipline needed for such an emergency. The contrast between the Jesuit Order, "the militia of Christ," the very incarnation of military obedience, and the Benedictine, with its traditions of sober learning and breadth of thought, and its ideal of family life, affords a typical illustration of the difference of Catholic *ethos* after and before the Reformation, or, in other words, in time of war and in time of peace. Mr. Ward strangely passes over the Benedictine Order as the pre-Reformation representative of the Catholic spirit, in favor of the Dominican Order of which he takes St. Thomas to be the type. And he is inclined to be over-sanguine in his belief that the state of siege which gave rise to a seemingly unplastic rigidity of doctrines and of claims, is now so far over that the Church is beginning to revert to earlier, freer, and more normal conditions. The trend of Catholic thought from the Vatican Council onwards would seem to most minds to be in the contrary direction. If, however, no more is meant than that the sharpness of controversy is sensibly diminishing and that the heat of the polemical spirit is dying out before a kindlier temper of Christian charity, there is no need to quarrel with the statement.

An excellent point is made when it is urged that, although divergences and misconceptions between Catholicism and the advanced school of Anglicanism are too deep to make reunion possible, a policy of *rapprochement* is not merely feasible, but necessary. Let Catholics and Anglicans work, shoulder to shoulder, for religious education, for the fundamental truths of Christianity, for the better observance of the moral law, for the social amelioration of the toiling masses at their gates ; let them present a united front against the daily increasing hordes of rationalism, agnosticism, secularism, and vice ; and the temper of sympathy engendered thereby will work more effectively for the removal of mutual prejudices, and through it to a mutual appreciation, than many tomes of acrid controversy.

The essential *semper eadem* of Catholic dogma, even in its most pronounced form, has been compatible with the assimilation of contemporary culture. This line of thought is drawn out in its bearings against the late Dr. Mivart, who represented every fresh discovery of science, as attended by "the groans of a strangled theologian," in one essay, and, in two further essays, against Professor Huxley and Ernest

Rénan. The change in our apprehension of propositions partly theological, partly scientific, is not the same thing as a modification of belief in what is essential to the identity of Christian dogma. To Dr. Mivart, rejection of the Incarnation was on all fours with rejection of the heliocentric view of the universe. The gradual changes which science has wrought in the beliefs of Catholics, *e. g.*, as to the locality of hell, are perfectly reconcilable with the maxim of the unchangeableness of Catholic dogma, when Newman's great principle is remembered—that a belief expressed to some extent in scientific terms, when it is retained in new relations and circumstances, "changes with them in order to remain the same." The living body changes as a condition of the same individual continuing to live. So with dogma. "It was not the Divine Revelation which changed; it was man with his equipment for its explication and expression who changed." We should have liked Mr. Ward to have developed at greater length his corollary that we must look for the operation of this undying principle of assimilation as the test of true development in our own age as well as in its predecessors.

Two of the essays that will appeal to a wide circle of readers are headed, respectively, "Two Mottoes of Cardinal Newman," and "Newman and Rénan." The "Mottoes" that form the text of the former and more original of the essays are *Cor ad cor loquitur* (chosen by Newman on receiving the Cardinal's hat), and *Ex umbris et imaginibus, in veritatem* (composed as an epitaph, still to be seen on the tablet to the Cardinal's memory in the cloisters of the Oratory at Birmingham). They point the way to the fundamental elements in Newman's philosophy. His analysis of our knowledge of the existence of our fellow-men shows that all we directly know is the *umbra*—the veil of voice and face. We infer from these the character, the *Veritas* of the personality. Yet the intercourse of mind with mind is so rapid that the process illustrates the companion motto, *Cor ad cor loquitur*. It is the same with our knowledge of Divine realities. Conscience is the *umbra et imago* of God. Yet Newman, in a famous passage in his *Apologia*, speaks of the self and the Creator as the only two "luminously self-evident beings!" The intimate personal intercourse between the soul and God in prayer and communion instances the truth of the motto, *Cor ad cor loquitur*. So with the living Church. Dogma and liturgy are the *umbra et imago* of Divine Revelation. Yet, in that they are the language whereby the Spirit of God speaks to the spirit of man, *Cor ad cor loquitur*. This is the underlying thought

of the "Essay on Development." Newman conceives the *ethos*,[1] or soul, of Catholicism as abiding behind the gradual unfolding of dogma. That *ethos* reflects the mind of God, who declares the same truth in different language to different ages.

In the essay on "Newman and Rénan," reprinted from the *Monthly Register*, Mr. Ward analyzes the fundamental difference on religion between the two men. To Newman the sense of sin and of the Divine Presence was essential to the right apprehension of dogma; Rénan was absolutely devoid of the Christian temperament. The realities *behind* theology were in the eyes of the one the *semper eadem;* they were as much beyond the range of the other's speculations as discussion on the distinction between colors is meaningless to a man born blind. Current theology was for Rénan the last word of Christian Apologetics. He knew nothing of, and cared less for, the idea of a growing body with a soul of Divine truth behind it as its explanation. It was lack of faith in the realities that theology adumbrates that lay at the root of the lack of patience and humility in theological discussions which he shared with Professor Huxley. While Newman from first to last believed that truth was objectively consistent in spite of antinomies that seemed for the time-being insoluble, Rénan saw only the contradictions on the surface, and ended in rationalism because the deeper principles of Faith were wholly beyond his ken.

The lighter essays of the book on Tennyson, Huxley, the Life of Mrs. Augustus Craven, and the Life-work of Cardinal Wiseman, contain many interesting passages, and show the author's customary insight into character. But the last-named of them is too much of a recapitulation of Mr. Ward's biography of Wiseman, while the others, for the most part, are out of harmony with the theological framework of the major part of the work. There is enough material in the other essays for a good-sized volume without the addition of any padding. As it is, Mr. Ward has sacrificed unity of design for mere bulk. He would have been better advised if he had split his book into two. Nevertheless, even in its present somewhat unwieldly form, it remains a noteworthy contribution to contemporary religious thought.

[1] The *ethos* of a society, or even of a place, was a favorite idea of Newman's. In his carefully drawn up plan of what the Oratory should be, he lays the greatest possible stress upon the *ethos* or spirit that should pervade its members.

SOCIALISM: THE NATION OF FATHERLESS CHILDREN. By David Goldstein. Edited by Martha Moore Avery. Pp. x—374. Boston: The Union News League. 1904.

The author of this book was for a long time a zealous worker in the cause of Socialism. For eight years, he says, he had been active as an "organizer, executive officer, and candidate of socialist parties." His devotion had been inspired and supported by the belief that the movement was for the betterment of the workingman's condition.

A systematic study of the socialistic philosophy as formulated by its internationally recognized leaders convinced him that his cherished belief was a delusion—a conviction which prolonged contact with the methods of socialist propaganda made ineradicable. He now realizes that in its very nature socialism does but prey upon "the ambitions and hopes of workingmen, leading them into the mazes of the materialistic den, where the beast now takes on the modern form of political atheism." He recognizes that "the atheistic forces which under the socialist propaganda are taking political form will compel a closer association of those organizations which stand for the propagation and enforcement of religious law," and it is his conviction, reached "without association or affiliation with the institution, that upon the *religious aspect* of this great issue the fight centres around the Catholic Church, which is the first and only Church that has boldly taken up the gauntlet thrown down . . . by socialism." Upon *economic ground*, however, "the battle to sustain the industrial progress will come to issue between the American Federation of Labor and the socialist propaganda organization. It will doubtless be a long-drawn series of hand-to-hand fights upon the floor of trade unions, and in the halls of trade-union conventions, State and National."

The author goes on to say that having fought desperately in the glare of its false light, the truth was at last revealed to him that Socialism is the cause of the damned, not the cause which makes men free, and that now with the strength of reason rather than the excitement of fanaticism he hopes to add somewhat to the victories of the American Federation of Labor. And certainly it would seem that the present book should go far in this direction, for it is a most vivid exposé of the avowed teachings of Socialism. Of course, one may ask at the very outset whether there is really such a system as Socialism. Socialists there are in plenty, theoretical and practical, and they all agree in the general tenet of State ownership and administration of the instruments of production. But is there a sufficiently unified consensus

of opinion to enable one to put together a summary of teachings that may truly be called by the singular noun "Socialism"? Our author is convinced that there is, and from a first-hand study of the authoritative teachers he has constructed such a summary. The value of his work consists precisely in this, that it brings together within comparatively small compass the characteristic tenets of socialist leaders on philosophical, religious, moral, social, political, and economic principles. As "a piece of literature," the work leaves something to be desired. But the author demurs to its being judged as such. As "a compendium of socialist data," however, it is a highly useful production—useful as a vehicle of information, and useful as a weapon in the anti-socialistic crusade for which it has been designed.

Recent Popular Books.

The purpose of the RECENT POPULAR BOOKS department is to give information to Catholic readers regarding the scope and character of new books likely to attract attention. While we deem it our duty to point out whatever is of an unhealthy tone or tendency in current fashionable literature and thus to guard the Catholic reader against it, we do not wish to be understood as recommending books which may be *characterized* by us without protest or criticism inasmuch as they maintain a neutral attitude toward faith and morals. It will be sufficient for consistent Catholics to know that certain books serve no better special purpose than to pass time, and that, however interestingly they may be written, or however much appreciated by a worldly-minded society, they are best known, not by being read, but through a brief unbiased notice of their contents and aim. Books that are elevating and helpful in the education of mind and heart, even when not written by authors professedly Catholic, will receive special and favorable criticism in our department of CRITICISMS AND NOTES. Popular works from Catholic pens are, *as a rule*, sufficiently discussed in our periodicals to dispense THE DOLPHIN from anything beyond a notice of them, since it should be understood that Catholics will acquire such books for their libraries.

Evans of Suffolk: Anna Farquhar. *Page.* $1.50.

A scion of a well-bred family of spotless reputation marries a girl who, in the effort to escape from the evil atmosphere surrounding her worthless father, has followed some very humble callings, and has stooped to some deceit. She is recognized by more than one of her husband's friends, and is compelled to make full confession both as to her career and her parentage. The story is better constructed than its author's former work, but it has many faults of execution.

Falk: Joseph Conrad. *McClure.* $1.50.

Three grim sea stories, really humorous but giving initial promise of tragedy, and written with much power.

Flodden Field: Alfred Austin. *Harper.* $1.20 *net.*

Absurdly prosaic phrases and sentences are so thickly strewn

throughout this book that its formal array as poetry seems utterly ludicrous. It represents Lady Heron of the Ford as being in love with Surrey and beguiling King James to linger with her, that he might arrive on the field of Flodden too late for anything but a disgraceful death. When she tells Surrey of her achievements he scornfully repulses her and she kills herself, to the reader's profound content.

Forest Hearth: Charles Major. *Macmillan.* $1.50.

Pioneer life in Indiana is the background for the familiar fate of the girl determined not to marry the suitor proposed to her by her father. The case is slightly complicated by her dissatisfaction with the lover of her choice because his past is not morally stainless, and the topic is cheerfully discussed by nearly all the characters. This is one of those books in which a formally moral ending is presented as an excuse for much talk of immorality.

Fortunes of Fifi: Molly Elliott Seawell. *Bobbs.* $1.50.

Fifi is a young person of audacity impossible even in a Parisian, but the author makes her pranks seem possible, even to the extent of outgeneralling Napoleon and outwitting the Pope. The book is undeniably amusing, in spite of its exaggeration, and the extravagance of its scenes with great personages, but the introduction of the Pope is to be regretted. That literary measure should be left to the great masters and to unbelievers.

Golden Chain: Gwendolen Overton. *Macmillan.* $0.50.

The heroine, a simple Mexican girl, shows a very noble spirit of self-sacrifice in behalf of the girl beloved by the man whom she loves. The tale is very slight but its three chief characters live.

Holt of Heathfield: Caroline A. Mason. *Macmillan.* $1.50.

The marriage of the hero, a Protestant minister, ends his pursuit by the matrimonially-inclined young women of his flock, but leaves him a helpless prey to the advice and criticism of his entire congregation. His various tribulations are described seriously, but it is difficult for a Catholic to sympathize with them and the effort does not seem necessary.

Home Builders: Carl Edwin Harriman. $1.50.

Polish immigrant workmen and their ways are the author's subject, and he treats it with the apparent intent of making every sordid accident prominent, but in one story he shows the transformation of the Polish instinctive rebellion against an oppressive government into devotion to a free government and this raises the average merit of the book. The fundamental error in his view of Polish character is his apparent ignorance of the devout tendency of both Jew and Gentile.

In Search of a Home: Phyllis O. Dent. *Longmans.* $1.25.

A country vicar serving temporarily in a London parish tries to console a dying mother by speaking to her of a great Home

open to all. Her little son endeavors to find this home, with happy results, but the book lacks the smallest atom of originality, and is really an unskilfully written Episcopalian tract.

Letters from a Son to His Self-Made Father: Charles Eustace Merriman. *New Hampshire Co.* $1.50.

The distinguishing note of the "Letters" is vulgar rudeness, and the author entirely fails in his effort to return the thrusts given to the sluggards of the rising generation in Mr. Lorimer's "Letters of a Self-Made Merchant to His Son."

Little Joan: John Strange Winter. *Lippincott.* $1.50.

The heroine, the "little" one among four tall sisters, loves a poor man unselfishly, but, when after a long absence he returns rich and prosperous, she suddenly discovers that she loves another man. This slight skeleton is very thinly clothed with conversation.

Mark: Aquila Kempster. *Doubleday.* $1.50.

The fashionable theme of a reincarnated soul is the central interest of the story, in which a young Englishman is alternately himself and a mere machine for doing the will of a dead prince whose former consort is on earth in the body of a sorceress. When she dies, the Englishman becomes normal. The fantasy is so managed as to make a natural explanation of the hero's behavior quite possible.

Master-Hand: Richard Dallas. *Putnam.* $1.50.

A story of murder and its detection in spite of the master-hand, the murderer, who throws suspicion upon an innocent man. The book is original in many ways, and the secret of the crime is well kept.

Master of Gray: H. C. Bailey. *Longmans.* $1.50.

In the hope of winning a girl's love, an Elizabethan adventurer plays fast and loose with the Scottish and English parties, but is not sufficiently skilful to deceive either, and ends by becoming obnoxious to both, and, inasmuch as the girl dies, hopeless for himself.

O'Ruddy: Stephen Crane and Robert Barr. *Stokes.* $1.50.

The authors seem to intend that the hero shall be taken seriously, but he is merely Charles Lever's impossible young Irishman raised to the tenth power, with a fraction of Barry Lynden for good luck. He is too flagrantly unnatural to be mischievous, and the remaining characters in the book are necessarily unnatural also, to account for their endurance of him.

Reign of Queen Isyl: Gelett Burgess and Will Irwin. *Lane.* $1.50.

The queen's sovereignty is bounded by the compass of a little local festival, and, such as it is, she holds it by being substituted for the person upon whom it has been bestowed by petty political

intrigue. This scheme is the framework in which amusingly whimsical tales are set.

Sally of Missouri: R. E. Young. $1.50.

State pride is really the heroine of this story, for Sally has no other salient characteristics, and it is through and by this that she is attractive to the male characters in the book. It is written with careful neglect of elegance and finish, bluntness being the author's chief aim.

She That Hesitates: Harris Dickson. *Bobbs*. $1.50.

"She" is Charlotte of Brunswick, the bride supposed to have been killed by Alexis, son of Peter the Great. The author endows her with a lover, a man sent by the Swedish ministers to win her heart from her imperial suitor; but honestly loving her, her apparent death is explained as a German physician's device to effect her escape from the Russian Court.

Spirit of the Service: Edith Elmer Wood. *Macmillan*. $1.50.

The author exhibits the devoted self-sacrifice of the American naval officer and his superiority to the intrigue of politicians who endeavor to control him and to employ him for their own ends. The spirit of the book is the same as that of many short stories having characters drawn from the naval service, but its form makes it more effective.

Varied Types: George K. Chesterton. *Dodd*. $1.20 *net*.

Continuous efforts to be paradoxical while professing to be critical, the results being ugly affectation varied by flat untruthfulness. The author is less brutal than Mr. G. Bernard Shaw, and less daring than Max Beerbohm, the other practitioners of his method.

Way of the Sea: Norman Duncan. *McClure*. $1.50.

Short stories of sea perils and of fishermen's especial temptations and troubles, spiritual and mental, related forcibly, but not so as to arouse sympathy.

Yellow Crayon: E. Phillips Oppenheim. *Dodd*. $1.50.

A tale of a wondrous secret organization, having the German Emperor for its titular head, numbering many of the European and British nobility among its members, and intended to oppose socialism, and radical politicians. Its unscrupulous members use it for their private ends, and the author describes the culminating incidents of its existence. He insists that British common sense invariably thwarts such societies when they try to work in Great Britain.

Literary Chat.

The Dublin publishers of Father Sheehan's *Under the Cedars and the Stars* have met with objection on the part of the United States Custom House to admit their volume to the American book market. The law demands that the plates of all foreign books imported into the United States, if previously published as serials in an American magazine, must be made in this country. The error has caused some delay in filling advance orders for the volume, and the loss affects not only the publishers but likewise the Catholic Truth Society of Ireland, which was to have the main benefit of the proceeds from the Dublin edition of the book. The volume published by THE DOLPHIN is not for sale, and only intended to make known and appreciated Father Sheehan's latest work, of which an eminent critic writes: "*Under the Cedars and the Stars* will serve to enhance Father Sheehan's reputation as a writer of charming English, a scholar and a sage. There are in it many passages of great power and of great beauty. One of the strongest and at the same time the finest things in the book is, to my mind, the series of paragraphs (pp. 207–210) on St. Benedict Joseph Labré. Only a master could handle the subject as it is handled here."

Father Matthew Russell, S.J., the genial editor of *The Irish Monthly*, and a poet of many sweet but always sacred moods, writes of Father Sheehan's volume: "This is the finest piece of literature, the most purely literary book, that has been produced in Ireland since Father Joseph Farrell's *Lectures of a Certain Professor*. Indeed, high as our appreciation has always been of the solitary work that the gifted Curate of Monasterevan left behind him, we are disposed already to recognize a larger degree of originality in this latest book of the Pastor of Doneraile. Dr. Sheehan is by no means "a man of one book"—to use that proverbial phrase out of its usual meaning. He will always be known as the author of *My New Curate*. Father Farrell's one book was a collection of essays of the ordinary form but of transcendent merit, which will, we trust, keep the book from being allowed to run out of print. *Under the Cedars and the Stars* is substantially a collection of essays also, but not at all arranged in the ordinary form. The book takes its name from the garden in which the author broods over these subjects, the cedars being rather sycamores, elms, and oaks. It is divided into four parts, named after the seasons, of which autumn comes first. Each of the four parts consists of three sections, so that we have twelve altogether, like the twelve months of the year; but no special attention is paid to the changing of moons. Every paragraph has its subject indicated and indented at the margin, and these are numbered continuously throughout each of the four parts, and announced in front of the volume in a very inviting table of contents. Of these miniature essays Autumn and Summer have ninety-three, Spring gets ninety-nine, and Winter heads the list with one hundred and fourteen. A vast number of topics bearing on religion, philosophy, literature, art, morality, external nature, and a thousand other matters, come up for discussion; and of course the same subject runs on through many paragraphs, so that much of the book might have been arranged in such a manner as to resemble the essays of Hazlitt or Stevenson. We have dwelt too long on the form of this beautiful book, but indeed it is impossible to criticise the substance except in general terms. No one can fail to be im-

pressed by the originality of thought and the eloquence and grace of style, as seen even in the first, hurried, fragmentary reading which is all that we have been as yet able to give to this spacious, pleasantly printed volume. We hope that it will be duly brought under the notice of the leading critical journals on both sides of the Atlantic; for it is a book quite out of the common run and such as London and New York do not expect to be sent to them by Dublin."—But the readers of THE DOLPHIN, for whom it was written, enjoyed it all last year.

Elsewhere in this issue we give a review of a work on Socialism by Mr. David Goldstein associate editor of *The Wage Worker* (Boston). The author is not a Catholic, and was years an enthusiastic advocate of the socialist doctrines which he eventually recognized as the inevitable source of destruction not only of religion and moral principle, but also of all that is desirable and healthy in human society. He has studied the question from all its aspects, and could not fail to note the attitude of the Catholic Church in the matter. Of it he says, that it is the first and only Church that has boldly taken up the gauntlet thrown down with scorn and defiance by Socialism. "*This Church is not only international, or rather universal, and so equipped to meet the power of the international enemy, but it is erected upon a basis—upon religious science—which gives it the strength to cope with the aggressions of the approaching foe.* There are, I am aware, many persons who would rather see hell reign than that the Catholic Church should be the victor in so great, so masterful a struggle—for such I have only sympathy, for they but veil themselves in darkness. *They may be assured, if this institution fall in the fight (if that were possible), all religions, sects, and cults would collapse in its ruins.*" (Preface, p. x.)

The current number of the *American Journal of Theology*, edited by the Divinity Faculty of the University of Chicago, opens with a paper on "The Religious Situation in Paris" by a resident observer of the events that have transpired since the publication of the Associations Law (*Loi Waldeck Rousseau*) in 1901. The author divides the blame between the "anti-religious party" and the "Ultramontane Catholic party," making the clergy responsible for advocating a confessional unity which subordinates all secular institutions to the Church, and charging the Combes-Pressensé political coalition with the intention of curtailing the liberties not only of the Catholic Church, but also of the Presbyterian, Lutheran, and Jewish religious denominations. One of the writer's statements is rather significant, coming as it does from what appears to be an entirely objective point of view. Speaking of the party that opposes the Catholic Religious Orders he says: "On the other hand, an increasing group of the Socialist party, the so called *Libertaires*, supported *by the great majority of the Freemasons* and by many scientific men, *are openly hostile to every religion*, which they denounce as standing in the way of social and scientific progress."

Miss Anita MacMahon, the translator of *Il Mistero del Poeta* by Fogazzaro, and contributor to *The Fortnightly Review*, *The Temple Bar Magazine*, *The Art Journal*, *The Italian Review*, THE DOLPHIN, and other high-class magazines, has in preparation a volume on the historic homes of the Dukes of Norfolk, which promises to be of especial interest in view of the present duke's proposed marriage to a member of the ancient Howard family. Miss MacMahon writes on St. Patrick and the Celts in the March number of THE DOLPHIN.

Those Protestant writers who affect to see in the beatification of Jeanne d'Arc a lessening of her glory as a purely national heroine, ought to remember that it was the Inquisition which rehabilitated the Maid of Orleans, after she had been unjustly condemned by a faction supported by the University of Paris. Patriotism did not attempt or succeed in saving her name from the infamous aspersions made against her character and her faith simply for political reasons; and although her accusers assigned "heresy" as one of the causes of her being burned at the stake, it was not the Church that sanctioned the plea, but the State which found a suitable tool in an unworthy churchman. At all events, Cardinal d'Estouteville insisted that the wrong be undone by an investigation placed in the hands of the Inquisition; and if Joan of Arc is recognized as the stainless patron of France, it is mainly due to the efforts of John Brehal, Grand Inquisitor, who became her advocate. The facts are recorded in a volume published some years ago by two French Dominicans, P. Belon, professor at the University of Lyons, and Fr. Balmes (Lethielleux, Paris).

Books Received.

THEOLOGY AND ASCETICA.

KIND WORDS FROM YOUR PASTOR. Or, A Missionary in the Family. The Rev. John F. Noll, New Haven, Ind. 1903. Pp. 80. $5.00 per hundred copies.

STUDIES IN SAINTSHIP. Translated from the French of Ernest Hello. With an Introduction by Virginia M. Crawford. London: Methuen & Co.; St. Louis, Mo.: B. Herder. 1903. Pp. 219. Price, $0.90.

DIE VERFASSUNG DER KIRCHE. Von den ersten Jahrzehnten der Apostolischen Wirksamkeit an bis zum Jahre 175 n. Chr. Von Heinrich Bruders, S.J. Mainz: Kirchheim & Co. 1904. (*Forschungen zur Christlichen Literatur und Dogmengeschichte.* Bd. IV, 1 u. 2.) Pp. 405.

THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN'S LECTIONARY. A Table for Bible Reading, so arranged as to follow the lessons contained in the Catholic Breviary. Compiled by W. Thornton Parker, M.D., Oblate Sec. O. S. B. Boston, Mass.: Thomas J. Flynn & Co. 1903. Pp. 23. Price, $0.15.

WOMAN. By the Rev. N. Walsh, S.J. Author of *Old and New*, etc. Dublin: M. H. Gill & Son; New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger Brothers. 1903. Pp. xi—114.

THE WORSHIPPERS AT BETHLEHEM. (From Father Faber.) Arranged by Winifred Mary Hill. With Prefatory note by the editor of *Characteristics from the Writings of Father Faber.* London: R. & T. Washbourne, 4 Paternoster Row; New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger Brothers. 1903. Pp. 117. Price, $0.30.

SHORT READINGS ON DEVOTION TO THE HOLY GHOST. For each day of the month. Being Extracts from the Works of Father Faber, Oratorian. Compiled by Father J. M. of the Order of Friars Minor, Capuchin. London: Burns & Oates, Limited, 28 Orchard Street. 1903. Pp. 64. Price, $0.25.

A BISHOP AND HIS FLOCK. By John Cuthbert Hedley, O.S.B., Bishop of Newport. London: Burns & Oates, Limited; New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger Brothers. 1903. Pp. viii—414–16. Price, $1.60.

THE REAL ST. FRANCIS OF ASSISI. By Fr. Paschal Robinson, O.F.M. Pp. 93. Published by *The Messenger*, 27 and 29 West Sixteenth Street, New York. Price, $0.25.

PHILOSOPHY AND SCIENCE.

TRAITÉ DE DROIT NATUREL. Théorie et Appliqué, par Tancrède Rothe, Docteur en Droit, Professeur aux Facultés Catholiques du Lille. Tome IV: Droit Laborique. Paris: Librairie de la Société du Recueil Général des Lois et des Arrêts. (Ancienne Maison L. Larose et Forcel) et Victor Lecoffre. 1904. Pp. 792. Prix, 12 francs.

THE PRINCIPLES OF MORAL SCIENCE. An Essay. By the Rev. Walter McDonald, D.D., Prefect of the Dunboyne Establishment, St. Patrick's College, Maynooth. Dublin: Browne and Nolan, Ltd. 1903. Pp. xi—230.

SOCIALISM: THE NATION OF FATHERLESS CHILDREN. By David Goldstein. Edited by Martha Moore-Avery. Boston: The Union News League, Inc. 1903. Pp. x—374. Price, $0.50.

BACTERIA, YEASTS AND MOLDS IN THE HOME. By H. W. Conn, Ph.D., Professor of Biology in Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn. Author of *Agricultural Bacteriology*, *Bacteria in Milk and its Products*, etc. Boston, U. S. A., and London: Ginn and Company (The Athenæum Press). 1903. Pp. vi—293. Price, $1.00.

HISTORY.

HANOVER AND PRUSSIA, 1795–1803. A Study in Neutrality. (Studies in History, Economics and Public Law, edited by the Faculty of Political Science of Columbia University, Vol. XVIII, No. 3.) By Guy Stanton Ford, B.L., Ph.D. New York: The Columbia University Press (The Macmillan Company, Agents; London: P. S. King and Son.) 1903. Pp. 317. Price, $2.00.

NAPOLEON THE FIRST. A Biography by August Fournier. Translated by Margaret Bacon Corwin and Arthur Dart Bissell. Edited by Edward Gaylord Bourne, Professor of History in Yale University. New York: Henry Holt and Co. 1903. Pp. 836.

GESCHICHTE UND WERT DER OFFIZIELLEN CHORALBÜCHER. Eine Studie von Franz Xaver Haberl. Regensburg, Rom, Neu York und Cincinnati: Fr. Pustet & Co. 1903. Pp. 63.

ISRAEL AND BABYLON. The Influence of Babylon on the Religion of Israel. A Reply to Delitzsch. By Herman Gunkel, D.D., Prof. University of Berlin. English Translation by F. S. B. Philadelphia: John J. McVey. 1904. Pp. 63. Price, $0.25.

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE ANGLICAN CRISIS. By the Right Rev. Monsignor Moyes, Theologian of the Archdiocese of Westminster. Brooklyn, New York: International Catholic Truth Society. Pp. 16. Price, $0.05.

THE TWO KENRICKS—Most Rev. Francis Patrick, Archbishop of Baltimore; Most Rev. Peter Richard, Archbishop of St. Louis. By John J. O'Shea. With an Introduction by Most Rev. Patrick John Ryan, Archbishop of Philadelphia. Philadelphia: John J. McVey. 1904. Pp. 495. Price, $1.50, *board*; $2.50, *cloth*.

ENGLISH HISTORY. An Illustrated Record in Four Volumes. Volume II: From the Age of Henry VIII to the Age of Milton. By Richard Garnett, C.B., LL.D., and Edmund Gosse, M.A., LL.D. Volume IV: From the Age of Johnson to the Age of Tennyson. By Edmund Gosse, Hon. M.A. of Trinity College, Cambridge, Hon. LL.D. of St. Andrew's University. New York: The Macmillan Company; London: Macmillan and Co, Ltd. 1904. Pp., Vol. II, xiv—389; Vol. IV, xii—462. Price, $6.00 each volume.

MISCELLANEOUS.

THE POET'S MYSTERY. A Novel. Translated from the Italian of Antonio Fogazzaro. By Anita MacMahon; Verses rendered by Algernon Warren. London: Duckworth & Co. 1903. Pp. vii—332. Price, 6s.

ORIGINAL CHURCH PAINTINGS. By Charles C. Svendson. P. O. Box 553. Cincinnati, Ohio.

ST. JOHN'S SEMINARY
3 8151 000 59915 6

ACCESSION NUMBER

SHELF NUMBER BS2903 D6

AUTHOR

TITLE The Dolphin Vol.V

DATE LOANED	BORROWER'S NAME	DATE RETURNED

ST. JOHN'S SEMINARY LIBRARY
BRIGHTON, MASS.

The cooperation of borrowers is requested in the matter of careful handling of the books and in their prompt return.

Books may be kept for two weeks and may be renewed, unless reserved.

If you cannot find what you want, ask the Librarian who will be glad to help you.

Further loaning of books, without notification of the Librarian, is not permitted.

Accession Number **Shelf Number**